A/39/PV.71-108

OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

PLENARY MEETINGS

VOLUME III

(of three volumes)

VERBATIM RECORDS OF THE 71st TO 108th MEETINGS

23 NOVEMBER—18 DECEMBER 1984

9 AND 12 APRIL AND 16 SEPTEMBER 1985

UNITED NATIONS

A/39/PV.71-108

OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

PLENARY MEETINGS

VOLUME III
(of three volumes)

VERBATIM RECORDS OF THE 71st TO 108th MEETINGS
23 NOVEMBER—18 DECEMBER 1984
9 AND 12 APRIL AND 16 SEPTEMBER 1985

UNITED NATIONS

READEX
FICHE

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Since the thirty-first session, the *Official Records of the General Assembly* have consisted of records of meetings, sessional fascicles for each of the Main Committees and the General Committee, annexes to the meeting records, supplements, the *List of Delegations* and the *Check List of Documents.* Information on other documents is given in the *Check List* and in the relevant annex fascicles.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

* * *

The records of the plenary meetings held during the thirty-ninth session appear in three volumes: the 1st to 31st meetings in volume I, the 32nd to 70th meetings in volume II, and the 71st to 108th meetings in volume III.

AGENDA OF THE THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Note. The figures in brackets indicate the numbers of the plenary meetings at which the agenda items were considered.

1. Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of Panama [1].
2. Minute of silent prayer or meditation [1, 108].
3. Credentials of representatives to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly [1, 32, 102]:
    - (*a*) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee;
    - (*b*) Report of the Credentials Committee.
4. Election of the President of the General Assembly [1].
5. Election of the officers of the Main Committees [2].
6. Election of the Vice-Presidents of the General Assembly [2].
7. Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations [54].
8. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work: reports of the General Committee [3, 27, 32].
9. General debate [4-31].
10. Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization [94].
11. Report of the Security Council [105, 106].
12. Report of the Economic and Social Council [87, 101, 104-106]:
    - (*a*) Report of the Council;
    - (*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General;
    - (*c*) Reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
13. Report of the International Court of Justice [94].
14. Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency [58, 59].
15. Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs [33, 34, 53, 77, 105]:
    - (*a*) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council;
    - (*b*) Election of eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council;
    - (*c*) Election of five members of the International Court of Justice.
16. Elections to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other elections [93]:
    - (*a*) Election of fifteen members of the Industrial Development Board;
    - (*b*) Election of twenty members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;
    - (*c*) Election of twelve members of the World Food Council;
    - (*d*) Election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;
    - (*e*) Election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;
    - (*f*) Election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme.
17. Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments [3, 93, 98, 105, 106, 108]:
    - (*a*) Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;
    - (*b*) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions;
    - (*c*) Appointment of a member of the Board of Auditors;
    - (*d*) Confirmation of the appointment of members of the Investments Committee;
    - (*e*) Appointment of members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal;
    - (*f*) International Civil Service Commission:
        - (i) Appointment of members of the Commission;
        - (ii) Designation of the Vice-Chairman of the Commission;

(*g*) Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit;

(*h*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;

(*i*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;

(*j*) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia;

(*k*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries.

18. Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [85-87, 100, 105]:
    (*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
    (*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General.
19. Admission of new Members to the United Nations [3].
20. The situation in Kampuchea: report of the Secretary-General [40-43].
21. Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference: report of the Secretary-General [54].
22. Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity: report of the Secretary-General [54].
23. Co-operation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States: report of the Secretary-General [54].
24. Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security: report of the Secretary-General [55, 56, 65].
25. The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives: report of the Secretary-General [35-39, 105, 108].
26. Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas): report of the Secretary-General [44-46].
27. Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte: report of the Secretary-General [94].
28. The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security: report of the Secretary-General [60-63].
29. Question of Namibia [78-84, 97]:
    (*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
    (*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;
    (*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General.
30. Co-operation between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee: report of the Secretary-General [93].
31. Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa [13, 66-71, 98, 99, 105]:
    (*a*) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid;*
    (*b*) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;
    (*c*) Report of the Secretary-General.
32. International Year of Peace: report of the Secretary-General [54].
33. Question of Palestine [88-92, 94, 95]:
    (*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;
    (*b*) Report of the Secretary-General.
34. Law of the sea: report of the Secretary-General [99].
35. United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy: report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy [99].
36. The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General [72-77, 101].
37. Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia [64, 65].

38. Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development [105-108].
39. Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council [105].
40. Commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations in 1985: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations [103].
41. Observance of the quincentenary of the discovery of America [105, 108].
42. Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General [105, 108].
43. Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations [105, 108].
44. Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq [105, 108].
45. Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/61 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) [97].
46. Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament [97].
47. Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty: report of the Conference on Disarmament [97].
48. Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General [97].
49. Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General [97].
50. Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Secretary-General [97].
51. Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament [97].
52. Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament [97].
53. Israeli nuclear armament: report of the Secretary-General [102].
54. Prevention of an arms race in outer space: report of the Conference on Disarmament [97].
55. Relationship between disarmament and development: report of the Disarmament Commission [102, 105].
56. Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/72 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests: report of the Conference on Disarmament [97].
57. Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa [97].
    - (*a*) Implementation of the Declaration: report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research;
    - (*b*) Nuclear capability of South Africa:
        - (i) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
        - (ii) Report of the Secretary-General.
58. Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament [97].
59. Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session [102]:
    - (*a*) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
    - (*b*) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;
    - (*c*) Status of multilateral disarmament agreements: report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*d*) Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon: report of the Conference on Disarmament;
    - (*e*) Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament: report of the Conference on Disarmament;
    - (*f*) Prevention of nuclear war: report of the Conference on Disarmament;
    - (*g*) Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session:

(i) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
(ii) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*h*) Unilateral nuclear disarmament measures: report of the Secretary-General;

(*i*) Comprehensive programme of disarmament: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*j*) Disarmament Week: report of the Secretary-General;

(*k*) Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations;

(*l*) Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies:
(i) Work of the Advisory Board: report of the Secretary-General;
(ii) Draft statute of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

60. Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly [97]:
(*a*) Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures: report of the Disarmament Commission;
(*b*) Freeze on nuclear weapons;
(*c*) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
(*d*) World Disarmament Campaign: report of the Secretary-General;
(*e*) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/73 E on a nuclear-arms freeze;
(*f*) Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament;
(*g*) Disarmament and international security: report of the Security Council;
(*h*) Regional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General.

61. Reduction of military budgets [97]:
(*a*) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General.

62. Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean [102].

63. World Disarmament Conference: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference [102].

64. Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons [97]:
(*a*) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;
(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General.

65. General and complete disarmament [102]:
(*a*) Study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General;
(*b*) Military research and development: report of the Secretary-General;
(*c*) Study on conventional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
(*d*) Measures to provide objective information on military capabilities: report of the Secretary-General;
(*e*) Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament;
(*f*) Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes: report of the Conference on Disarmament;
(*g*) Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans: report of the Secretary-General;
(*h*) Contribution of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament.

66. Question of Antarctica: report of the Secretary-General [102].

67. Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region: report of the Secretary-General [102].

68. Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [102]:
(*a*) Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Security Council;
(*b*) Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace: report of the Secretary-General.

69. Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations [102, 105].
70. Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation [100].
71. Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories: reports of the Secretary-General [100].
72. International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space [100]:
    - (*a*) Report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;
    - (*b*) Implementation of the recommendations of the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space: report of the Secretary-General.
73. Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations [100].
74. Questions relating to information [100]:
    - (*a*) Report of the Committee on Information;
    - (*b*) Report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*c*) Report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
75. United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [100]:
    - (*a*) Report of the Commissioner-General;
    - (*b*) Report of the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;
    - (*c*) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine;
    - (*d*) Reports of the Secretary-General.
76. International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees: report of the Secretary-General [100].
77. Israel's decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea: report of the Secretary-General [100].
78. Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India [100].
79. Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations [100].
80. Development and international economic co-operation [103, 104, 106, 107]:
    - (*a*) International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade:
        - (i) Report of the Committee on the Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;
        - (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*b*) Review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States: report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*c*) Trade and development:
        - (i) Report of the Trade and Development Board;
        - (ii) Reports of the Secretary-General;
    - (*d*) Industrialization:
        - (i) Report of the Fourth General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;
        - (ii) Report of the Industrial Development Board;
        - (iii) Report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;
    - (*e*) Science and technology for development: report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development;
    - (*f*) Food problems:
        - (i) Report of the World Food Council;
        - (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*g*) Economic and technical co-operation among developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;

- (*h*) Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General;
- (*i*) Environment:
  - (i) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;
  - (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;
- (*j*) Human settlements:
  - (i) Report of the Commission on Human Settlements;
  - (ii) Reports of the Secretary-General;
- (*k*) Effective mobilization and integration of women in development: report of the Secretary-General;
- (*l*) United Nations Special Fund;
- (*m*) New and renewable sources of energy: report of the Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy;
- (*n*) Implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries: report of the Secretary-General;
- (*o*) Immediate measures in favour of the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;
- (*p*) Development of the energy resources of developing countries: report of the Secretary-General.

81. Operational activities for development [104, 106]:
    - (*a*) Operational activities of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*b*) United Nations Development Programme: report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*c*) United Nations Capital Development Fund;
    - (*d*) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;
    - (*e*) United Nations Volunteers programme;
    - (*f*) United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;
    - (*g*) United Nations Children's Fund;
    - (*h*) World Food Programme;
    - (*i*) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
    - (*j*) Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund and allocation of the remaining balance: report of the Secretary-General.
82. Training and research [103]:
    - (*a*) United Nations Institute for Training and Research:
      - (i) Report of the Executive Director;
      - (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;
    - (*b*) United Nations University: report of the Council of the United Nations University.
83. Special economic and disaster relief assistance [103]:
    - (*a*) Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator: reports of the Secretary-General;
    - (*b*) Special programmes of economic assistance: reports of the Secretary-General;
    - (*c*) Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region: report of the Secretary-General.
84. Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa [71].
85. International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace: report of the Secretary-General [71].
86. Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General [71].

87. Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights: reports of the Secretary-General [71].
88. Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination [71]:
    (*a*) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;
    (*b*) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;
    (*c*) Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*: report of the Secretary-General.
89. Policies and programmes relating to youth: report of the Secretary-General [71].
90. Question of aging: report of the Secretary-General [71].
91. Implementation of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons: report of the Secretary-General [71].
92. International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: report of the Secretary-General [101, 106].
93. United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace [101, 106, 107]:
    (*a*) Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women: report of the Secretary-General;
    (*b*) Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women;
    (*c*) Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women: report of the Secretary-General.
94. Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women [101]:
    (*a*) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women;
    (*b*) Status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: report of the Secretary-General.
95. Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance [101].
96. Human rights and scientific and technological developments [101].
97. Question of a convention on the rights of the child [101].
98. International Covenants on Human Rights [101]:
    (*a*) Report of the Human Rights Committee;
    (*b*) Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Secretary-General;
    (*c*) Elaboration of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.
99. Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: reports of the Secretary-General [93].
100. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [101]:
    (*a*) Report of the High Commissioner;
    (*b*) Assistance to refugees in Africa: report of the Secretary-General.
101. International campaign against traffic in drugs: report of the Secretary-General [101].
102. Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms [101]:
    (*a*) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/124;
    (*b*) National institutions for the protection and promotion of human rights: report of the Secretary-General.
103. Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations [87]:
    (*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
    (*b*) Report of the Secretary-General.

104. Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [87].
105. Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations [87]:
    (*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
    (*b*) Report of the Secretary-General.
106. United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General [87].
107. Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General [87].
108. Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors [98]:
    (*a*) United Nations;
    (*b*) United Nations Development Programme;
    (*c*) United Nations Children's Fund;
    (*d*) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;
    (*e*) United Nations Institute for Training and Research;
    (*f*) Voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;
    (*g*) Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme;
    (*h*) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;
    (*i*) United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation;
    (*j*) United Nations Industrial Development Fund.
109. Programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985 [105].
110. Programme planning [105, 107]:
    (*a*) Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;
    (*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General.
111. Financial emergency of the United Nations [105]:
    (*a*) Report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations;
    (*b*) Report of the Secretary-General.
112. Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency [105]:
    (*a*) Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;
    (*b*) Impact of inflation and monetary instability on the regular budget of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General;
    (*c*) Feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal: report of the Secretary-General.
113. Joint Inspection Unit: reports of the Joint Inspection Unit [105].
114. Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences [98].
115. Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions [1, 3, 105-108].
116. Personnel questions [105]:
    (*a*) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General;
    (*b*) Respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations: report of the Secretary-General;
    (*c*) Other personnel questions: reports of the Secretary-General.
117. United Nations common system [81, 98]:
    (*a*) Report of the International Civil Service Commission;
    (*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General.

118. United Nations pension system: report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board [105].

119. Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East [81, 98]:
    (*a*) United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General;
    (*b*) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: report of the Secretary-General.

120. Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order: report of the Secretary-General [99].

121. Observer status of national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States: report of the Secretary-General [99].

122. Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts: report of the Secretary-General [99].

123. Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States [99].

124. Peaceful settlement of disputes between States [99].

125. Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind: report of the Secretary-General [99].

126. Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations [99, 105].

127. Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its seventeenth session [99].

128. Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives: report of the Secretary-General [99].

129. Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries [99, 105].

130. Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session [99].

131. United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations: report of the Secretary-General [99].

132. Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country [99].

133. Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization [99].

134. Draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally: report of the Secretary-General [99].

135. Review of the multilateral treaty-making process [99].

136. Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment [99].

137. Draft standard rules of procedure for United Nations conferences: report of the Secretary-General [99].

138. Right of peoples to peace [57].

139. Critical economic situation in Africa [47-52, 83].

140. Celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in the British Empire [105, 108].

141. Countries stricken by desertification and drought [103].

142. Use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind [97].

143. Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States [102].

VOLUME III

Contents

Page

Agenda of the thirty-ninth session iii

Abbreviations xxviii

71st meeting

Friday, 23 November 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 84:

Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa

AGENDA ITEM 86:

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 87:

Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights: reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 88:

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination; 1261

(*b*) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid:* report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 85:

International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace: report of the Secretary-General

Page

AGENDA ITEM 89:

Policies and programmes relating to youth: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 90:

Question of aging: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 91:

Implementation of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 31:

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid;*

(*b*) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

(*c*) Report of the Secretary-General 1267

72nd meeting

Monday, 26 November 1984, at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36:

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General 1289

73rd meeting

Monday, 26 November 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36:

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*) 1303

74th meeting

Tuesday, 27 November 1984, at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36:

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*) 1325

Page

75th meeting

Tuesday, 27 November 1984, at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36:

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*) 1339

76th meeting

Wednesday, 28 November 1984, at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36:

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*) 1363

77th meeting

Wednesday, 28 November 1984, at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36:

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*) 1381

AGENDA ITEM 15:

Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs (*continued*):

(*a*) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council 1383

78th meeting

Thursday, 29 November 1984, at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1387

79th meeting

Thursday, 29 November 1984, at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1401

Page

80th meeting

Friday, 30 November 1984, at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1417

81st meeting

Friday, 30 November 1984, at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 117:

United Nations common system:

(*a*) Report of the International Civil Service Commission;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1427

AGENDA ITEM 119:

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East:

(*a*) United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1428

82nd meeting

Monday, 3 December 1984, at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1457

Page

83rd meeting

Monday, 3 December 1984, at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1471

AGENDA ITEM 139:

Critical economic situation in Africa (*concluded*) 1503

84th meeting

Tuesday, 4 December 1984, at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1513

85th meeting

Tuesday, 4 December 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1529

86th meeting

Wednesday, 5 December 1984, at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*):

Page

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1549

Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (*concluded*) 1566

87th meeting

Wednesday, 5 December 1984, at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 103:

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 104: 1567

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

AGENDA ITEMS 105 AND 12:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations:

Page

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters I and VI (section E))

AGENDA ITEM 106:

United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 107:

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General

88th meeting

Thursday, 6 December 1984, at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 33:

Question of Palestine:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General 1575

89th meeting

Thursday, 6 December 1984, at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 33:

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General 1589

90th meeting

Friday, 7 December 1984, at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 33:

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General 1607

91st meeting

Friday, 7 December 1984, at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 33:

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

Page

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General 1623

92nd meeting

Monday, 10 December 1984, at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 33:

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General 1649

93rd meeting

Monday, 10 December 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 99:

Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: reports of the Secretary-General 1665

AGENDA ITEM 16:

Elections to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other elections:

(*a*) Election of fifteen members of the Industrial Development Board;

(*b*) Election of twenty members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;

(*c*) Election of twelve members of the World Food Council;

(*d*) Election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;

(*e*) Election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;

(*f*) Election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme 1668

AGENDA ITEM 17:

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):

(*h*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;

(*k*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries 1670

Page

AGENDA ITEM 30:

Co-operation between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee: report of the Secretary-General.. 1671

94th meeting

Tuesday, 11 December 1984, at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 10:

Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization 1677

AGENDA ITEM 13:

Report of the International Court of Justice .. 1677

AGENDA ITEM 27:

Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte: report of the Secretary-General 1677

AGENDA ITEM 33:

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General 1685

95th meeting

Tuesday, 11 December 1984, at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 33:

Question of Palestine (*concluded*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General 1691

96th meeting

Wednesday, 12 December 1984, at 11.10 a.m.

COMMEMORATION OF THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE CHARTER OF ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES 1717

97th meeting

Wednesday, 12 December 1984, at 3.55 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29:

Question of Namibia (*concluded*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

Page

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1739

AGENDA ITEM 45:

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/61 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

AGENDA ITEM 46:

Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 47:

Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 48:

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 49:

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 50:

Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 51:

Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 52:

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 54:

Prevention of an arms race in outer space: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 56: 1764

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/72 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests: report of the Conference on Disarmament

Page

AGENDA ITEM 57:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa:

(*a*) Implementation of the Declaration: report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research;

(*b*) Nuclear capability of South Africa:

  (i) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

  (ii) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 58:

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 60:

Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly:

(*a*) Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures: report of the Disarmament Commission;

(*b*) Freeze on nuclear weapons;

(*c*) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;

(*d*) World Disarmament Campaign: report of the Secretary-General;

(*e*) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/73 E on a nuclear-arms freeze;

(*f*) Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*g*) Disarmament and international security: report of the Security Council;

(*h*) Regional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 61:

Reduction of military budgets:

(*a*) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 64:

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons:

(*a*) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;

Page

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 142:

Use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind

98th meeting

Thursday, 13 December 1984, at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 17:

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):

(*a*) Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

(*b*) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions;

(*c*) Appointment of a member of the Board of Auditors;

(*d*) Confirmation of the appointment of members of the Investments Committee;

(*e*) Appointment of members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal;

(*f*) International Civil Service Commission:

  (i) Appointment of members of the Commission;

  (ii) Designation of the Vice-Chairman of the Commission

AGENDA ITEM 108:

Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors:

(*a*) United Nations;

(*b*) United Nations Development Programme;

(*c*) United Nations Children's Fund;

(*d*) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East; 1781

(*e*) United Nations Institute for Training and Research;

(*f*) Voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

(*g*) Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme;

(*h*) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;

(*i*) United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation;

Page

(j) United Nations Industrial Development Fund

AGENDA ITEM 114:

Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences

AGENDA ITEM 117:

United Nations common system (*concluded*):

(a) Report of the International Civil Service Commission;

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 119:

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (*concluded*):

(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 31:

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*):

(a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid;*

(b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

(c) Report of the Secretary-General 1785

99th meeting

Thursday, 13 December 1984, at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 31:

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*):

(a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*

(b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports

(c) Report of the Secretary-General 1795

AGENDA ITEM 34:

Law of the Sea: report of the Secretary-General 1820

AGENDA ITEM 35:

United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy: report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy 1834

Page

AGENDA ITEM 120:

Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 121:

Observer status of national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 122:

Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 123:

Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States

AGENDA ITEM 124:

Peaceful settlement of disputes between States

AGENDA ITEM 125:

Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 126:

Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations

AGENDA ITEM 127:

Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its seventeenth session

AGENDA ITEM 128: 1836

Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 129:

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries

AGENDA ITEM 130:

Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session

Page

AGENDA ITEM 131:

United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 132:

Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country

AGENDA ITEM 133:

Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization

AGENDA ITEM 134:

Draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 135:

Review of the multilateral treaty-making process

AGENDA ITEM 136:

Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment

AGENDA ITEM 137:

Draft standard rules of procedure for United Nations conferences: report of the Secretary-General

100th meeting

Friday, 14 December 1984, at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1845

AGENDA ITEM 70:

Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

Page

AGENDA ITEM 71:

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories: reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 72:

International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

(*b*) Implementation of the recommendations of the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 73:

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

AGENDA ITEM 74:

Questions relating to information:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on Information;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

AGENDA ITEM 75: 1850

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East:

(*a*) Report of the Commissioner-General;

(*b*) Report of the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;

(*c*) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine;

(*d*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 76:

International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 77:

Israel's decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea: report of the Secretary-General

Page

AGENDA ITEM 78:

Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India

AGENDA ITEM 79:

Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations

101st meeting

Friday, 14 December 1984, at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12:

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Economic and Social Council (chaps. I, II, III (part I, sects. A to C and E, and part II, sect. D), IV (sect. A), V (sects. A, B and D), VII, VIII and IX (part I, sect. H));

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

AGENDA ITEM 92:

International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 93:

United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace:

(*a*) Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women;

(*c*) Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 94:

Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women;

(*b*) Status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: report of the Secretary-General

Page

AGENDA ITEM 95: 1861

Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance

AGENDA ITEM 96:

Human rights and scientific and technological developments

AGENDA ITEM 97:

Question of a convention on the rights of the child

AGENDA ITEM 98:

International Covenants on Human Rights:

(*a*) Report of the Human Rights Committee;

(*b*) Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Elaboration of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty

AGENDA ITEM 100:

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees:

(*a*) Report of the High Commissioner;

(*b*) Assistance to refugees in Africa: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 101:

International campaign against traffic in drugs: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 102:

Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms:

(*a*) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/124;

(*b*) National institutions for the protection and promotion of human rights: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 36:

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*concluded*) 1873

Page

102nd meeting

Monday, 17 December 1984, at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 3:

Credentials of representatives to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly (*concluded*):

(*a*) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee;

(*b*) Report of the Credentials Committee 1891

AGENDA ITEM 53:

Israeli nuclear armament: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 55:

Relationship between disarmament and development: report of the Disarmament Commission

AGENDA ITEM 59:

Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session:

(*a*) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

(*b*) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*c*) Status of multilateral disarmament agreements: report of the Secretary-General;

(*d*) Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*e*) Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*f*) Prevention of nuclear war: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*g*) Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session:

  (i) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

  (ii) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*h*) Unilateral nuclear disarmament measures: report of the Secretary-General;

(*i*) Comprehensive programme of disarmament: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*j*) Disarmament Week: report of the Secretary-General;

Page

(*k*) Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations;

(*l*) Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies:

  (i) Work of the Advisory Board: report of the Secretary-General;

  (ii) Draft statute of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

AGENDA ITEM 62:

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean

AGENDA ITEM 63:

World Disarmament Conference: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference

AGENDA ITEM 65: 1891

General and complete disarmament:

(*a*) Study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Military research and development: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Study on conventional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;

(*d*) Measures to provide objective information on military capabilities: report of the Secretary-General;

(*e*) Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*f*) Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*g*) Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans: report of the Secretary-General;

(*h*) Contribution of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 66:

Question of Antarctica: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 67:

Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region: report of the Secretary-General

Page

AGENDA ITEM 68:

Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security:

(*a*) Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Security Council;

(*b*) Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 69:

Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations

AGENDA ITEM 143:

Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States

103rd meeting

Monday, 17 December 1984, at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 40:

Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations in 1985: Report of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations 1909

AGENDA ITEM 80:

Development and international economic co-operation:

(*a*) International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade:
  (i) Report of the Committee on the Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;
  (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States: report of the Secretary-General;

(*e*) Science and technology for development: report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development;

(*f*) Food problems:
  (i) Report of the World Food Council;
  (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*i*) Environment:
  (i) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;
  (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*j*) Human settlements:
  (i) Report of the Commission on Human Settlements;
  (ii) Reports of the Secretary-General;

(*k*) Effective mobilization and integration of women in development: report of the Secretary-General;

(*l*) United Nations Special Fund;

(*m*) New and renewable sources of energy: report of the Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy;

(*n*) Implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries: report of the Secretary-General;

(*o*) Immediate measures in favour of the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;

(*p*) Development of the energy resources of developing countries: report of the Secretary-General 1919

AGENDA ITEM 82:

Training and research:

(*a*) United Nations Institute for Training and Research:
  (i) Report of the Executive Director;
  (ii) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) United Nations University: report of the Council of the United Nations University 1923

AGENDA ITEM 83:

Special economic and disaster relief assistance:

(*a*) Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator: reports of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Special programmes of economic assistance: reports of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region: report of the Secretary-General .. 1924

Page

AGENDA ITEM 141:

Countries stricken by desertification and drought 1926

104th meeting

Tuesday, 18 December 1984, at 11.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 80:

Development and international economic co-operation (*continued*):

(*c*) Trade and development:
  (i) Report of the Trade and Development Board;
  (ii) Reports of the Secretary-General;

(*g*) Economic and technical co-operation among developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;

(*h*) Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General 1927

AGENDA ITEM 81:

Operational activities for development:

(*a*) Operational activities of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) United Nations Development Programme: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) United Nations Capital Development Fund;

(*d*) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;

(*e*) United Nations Volunteers programme;

(*f*) United Nations Special Fund for Land-Locked Developing Countries;

(*g*) United Nations Children's Fund;

(*h*) World Food Programme;

(*i*) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;

(*j*) Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund and allocation of the remaining balance: report of the Secretary-General 1930

AGENDA ITEM 12:

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Council (chapters I, II, III (part I, sections D, F and G, and part II, sections A to C and E to G), IV, VI (sections A to C), VIII and IX (part I, sections D, E, J to N and Q));

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1931

AGENDA ITEM 80:

Development and international economic co-operation (*continued*):

(*d*) Industrialization:
  (i) Report of the Fourth General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;
  (ii) Report of the Industrial Development Board;
  (iii) Report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization 1934

105th meeting

Tuesday, 18 December 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 15:

Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs (*concluded*):

(*a*) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council 1939

AGENDA ITEM 12:

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 109:

Programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985

AGENDA ITEM 110:

Programme planning:

(*a*) Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 111:

Financial emergency of the United Nations:

(*a*) Report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 112:

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency:

(*a*) Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions; 1940

Page

(*b*) Impact of inflation and monetary instability on the regular budget of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 113:

Joint Inspection Unit: reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

AGENDA ITEM 116:

Personnel questions:

(*a*) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Other personnel questions: reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 118:

United Nations pension system: report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board

AGENDA ITEM 11:

Report of the Security Council 1945

AGENDA ITEM 12:

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*) 1946

AGENDA ITEM 17:

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):

(*g*) Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit;

(*i*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;

(*j*) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia 1946

AGENDA ITEM 25:

The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) 1947

AGENDA ITEM 38:

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development 1947

Page

AGENDA ITEM 39:

Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council 1948

AGENDA ITEM 41:

Observance of the quincentenary of the discovery of America 1948

AGENDA ITEM 42:

Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General 1948

AGENDA ITEM 43:

Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations 1948

AGENDA ITEM 44:

Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq 1949

AGENDA ITEM 140:

Celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in the British Empire 1949

AGENDA ITEM 126:

Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations (*concluded*) 1949

AGENDA ITEM 129:

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries (*concluded*) ... 1949

AGENDA ITEM 55:

Relationship between disarmament and development: report of the Disarmament Commission (*concluded*) 1949

AGENDA ITEM 69:

Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations (*concluded*) . 1949

AGENDA ITEM 31:

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*concluded*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid;*

(*b*) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

Page

(*c*) Report of the Secretary-General 1950

AGENDA ITEM 18:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*concluded*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1950

AGENDA ITEM 115:

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*) 1950

PROGRAMME OF WORK 1950

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT 1951

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION 1953

106th meeting

Tuesday, 9 April 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF THE SESSION 1955

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. KONSTANTIN USTINOVICH CHERNENKO, PRESIDENT OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION, AND OF MR. TOM ADAMS, PRIME MINISTER OF BARBADOS 1955

AGENDA ITEM 115:

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*) 1955

AGENDA ITEM 11:

Report of the Security Council (*concluded*) ... 1955

AGENDA ITEM 12:

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Council (chapters I, II, III (part I, sections D, F and G and part II, sections A to C and E to G), IV, VI (sections A to C), VIII and IX (part I, sections D, E, J to N and Q));

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1955

Page

AGENDA ITEMS 12 AND 92:

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*concluded*)

International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*) } 1957

AGENDA ITEM 17:

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):

(*g*) Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit 1957

AGENDA ITEM 38:

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development (*continued*) 1957

AGENDA ITEM 80:

Development and international economic co-operation (*continued*):

(*c*) Trade and development:

(i) Report of the Trade and Development Board;

(ii) Reports of the Secretary-General ... 1957

AGENDA ITEM 81:

Operational activities for development (*concluded*):

(*j*) Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund and allocation of the remaining balance: report of the Secretary-General 1958

AGENDA ITEM 93:

United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (*continued*):

(*b*) Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women 1958

107th meeting

Friday, 12 April 1985, at 12.20 p.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. ENVER HOXHA, FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE LABOUR PARTY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT OF THE SOCIALIST PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA 1959

Page

AGENDA ITEM 115:

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*) 1959

AGENDA ITEM 38:

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development (*continued*) 1959

AGENDA ITEM 80:

Development and international economic co-operation (*concluded*):

(*c*) Trade and development:

(i) Report of the Trade and Development Board;

(ii) Reports of the Secretary-General ... 1961

AGENDA ITEM 93:

United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (*concluded*):

(*b*) Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women 1961

AGENDA ITEM 110:

Programme planning (*concluded*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General 1962

AGENDA ITEM 115:

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*) 1962

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION 1965

108th meeting

Monday, 16 September 1985, at 3.35 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF THE SESSION 1967

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF A HEAD OF STATE AND FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. 1967

Page

AGENDA ITEM 115:

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*concluded*) 1968

AGENDA ITEM 17:

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*concluded*):

(*i*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development . 1968

AGENDA ITEM 25:

The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*) 1969

AGENDA ITEM 38:

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development (*concluded*) 1969

AGENDA ITEM 41:

Observance of the quincentenary of the discovery of America (*concluded*) 1971

AGENDA ITEM 42:

Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*) 1971

AGENDA ITEM 43:

Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations (*concluded*) 1971

AGENDA ITEM 44:

Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq (*concluded*) 1971

AGENDA ITEM 140:

Celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in the British Empire (*concluded*) 1971

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT 1971

AGENDA ITEM 2:

Minute of silent prayer or meditation 1973

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION 1973

ABBREVIATIONS

ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IDA	International Development Association
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMO	International Maritime Organization
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDOF	United Nations Disengagement Observer Force
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEF	United Nations Emergency Force
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFICYP	United Nations Force in Cyprus
UNFPA	United Nations Fund for Population Activities
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UNTAG	United Nations Transition Assistance Group
UNTSO	United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine
UPU	Universal Postal Union
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

71st PLENARY MEETING
Friday, 23 November 1984,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 84

Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa

AGENDA ITEM 86

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 87

Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights: reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 88

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;

(*b*) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid:* report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 85

International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 89

Policies and programmes relating to youth: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 90

Question of aging: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 91

Implementation of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons: report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. POLOWCZYK (Poland), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: I have the honour and privilege of presenting to the General Assembly this afternoon for consideration and approval eight reports of the Third Committee, on agenda items 84, 86 to 88, 85 and 89 to 91. I will refer to the reports on those items in that order.

2. In paragraph 9 of its report on agenda item 84 [*A/39/654*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution which was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 104 to 9, with 17 abstentions.

3. In paragraph 8 of its report on agenda item 86 [*A/39/656*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution which it adopted by consensus.

4. In paragraph 9 of its report on agenda item 87 [*A/39/657*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions. Draft resolution I was adopted by a recorded vote of 105 to 17, with 9 abstentions. Draft resolution II was adopted without a vote.

5. In paragraph 15 of its report on agenda item 88 [*A/39/658*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of three draft resolutions. Draft resolution I was adopted by a recorded vote of 110 to 1 with 23 abstentions. Draft resolution II was adopted without a vote. With regard to draft resolution III, after separate, recorded votes on paragraphs 2, 3 and 12, the Committee adopted the draft resolution as a whole by a recorded vote of 137 to 1.

6. In paragraph 14 of its report on agenda item 85 [*A/39/655*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions which it adopted without a vote.

7. In paragraph 8 of its report on agenda item 89 [*A/39/659*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution which it adopted without a vote.

8. In paragraph 8 of its report on agenda item 90 [*A/39/660*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution which it adopted without a vote.

9. In paragraph 11 of its report on agenda item 91 [*A/39/661*], the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution which it adopted without a vote.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee.

10. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Third Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

11. May I remind members that, in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the Assembly decided that when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. I also remind members that, in accordance with Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

12. We shall first take up the report of the Committee on agenda item 84 [*A/39/654*]. I call on the representative of Ecuador, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting on the proposal before the Assembly.

13. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Ecuador, a free, democratic, law-abiding country which respects the principles on which its international policy is based, maintains in all world forums its unswerving position in favour of human rights and rejects all policies of racial discrimination. It could not be otherwise, since article 4 of the Ecuadorian Constitution states that the Ecuadorian State condemns all forms of colonialism, neo-colonialism, discrimination or racial segregation and recognizes the right of peoples to throw off the yoke of these oppressive systems. Therefore, as it did in the Third Committee, Ecuador will vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report [*A/39/654*].

14. I should, however, emphasize the need for universal, and not selective, implementation of the principle of condemnation of every form of racial discrimination wherever it occurs. Moreover, we do not agree with the inappropriate wording of certain paragraphs of the draft resolutions under agenda items 84, 86, 87 and 88, although we shall vote in favour of or join in the consensus on them. Our dissatisfaction with the wording stems from the unnecessary use of inappropriate, far-fetched language which, instead of creating a climate conducive to political solutions, would tend to exacerbate tension and engender violence in international relations.

15. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report [*A/39/654*]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is in document A/39/681. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to 10, with 14 abstentions (resolution 39/15).[1]

16. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

17. Miss MOOKODI (Botswana): My delegation wishes to inform the General Assembly that although we voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted we reserve our position on subparagraphs (*c*) and (*d*) of paragraph 5 and on paragraph 12, for reasons well known to the Assembly.

18. Mrs. NHLABATSI (Swaziland): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/39/654, but would like to state its reservation on subparagraphs (*c*) and (*d*) of paragraph 5, for reasons known to the Assembly.

19. Mr. VILLAGRA DELGADO (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Argentina voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/39/654 because it is convinced that it is useful to exert pressure on South Africa to abandon its policy of racial discrimination. However, the name of Aerolíneas Argentinas has again been included in the list contained in the updated report on the adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the colonial and racist régime in southern Africa, prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities of the Commission on Human Rights.[2] As explained in the note dated 21 September 1984 from the Permanent Mission of Argentina to the Centre for Human

Rights [*A/C.3/39/2*], Aerolíneas Argentinas has not been flying to South Africa since 1981 and this was duly communicated to the Special Rapporteur.[3] Therefore, my country hopes that this error will be corrected and that the name of Argentina will be deleted from the list.

20. Mr. MBANZE (Mozambique): In voting in favour of the draft resolution submitted under agenda item 84, my delegation joined the international community in reaffirming that any collaboration with the racist régime constitutes a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa in their struggle for the establishment of a non-racial, undivided and democratic society in that country, a society wherein each South African, regardless of race, sex or religion, may benefit from the wealth of the country and attain social development.

21. We also expressed our deep concern at the fact that such collaboration remains one of the main obstacles to the eradication of the *apartheid* system, as well as to the elimination of its inhuman, cruel policies. This collaboration also encourages the régime in perpetrating its acts of aggression against neighbouring States. For these reasons, we join the international community in condemning such collaboration.

22. We also share the view that the Security Council should consider taking adequate measures, including those envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

23. However, my delegation would like to put on record that the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique is not in a position to apply sanctions against South Africa for reasons stemming from the geographical position of Mozambique and the historical past imposed on it by colonialism.

24. Therefore, my delegation would like to express its reservations in regard to paragraph 5 of the resolution just adopted.

25. Miss QOANE (Lesotho): My delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted. However, we would like to put on record that the well-known position of the Lesotho Government with respect to sanctions against South Africa still stands. We therefore reserve our position on subparagraphs (*c*) and (*d*) of paragraph 5.

26. The PRESIDENT: We will now turn to the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 86 [*A/39/656*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/683. The draft resolution was adopted by the Third Committee by consensus. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/16).

27. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the resolution just adopted.

28. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The position of the Syrian Arab Republic on the question of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* in all their forms and manifestations is known to everyone. There is no need for me to repeat it now, as my delegation spoke at the 12th meeting of the Third Committee when it considered questions related to racism and the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. My delegation reiterated its view of the Second Decade as being linked to the first Decade, as well as supplementing it. Hence, the concepts of racism as defined in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [*resolution 2106 A (XX), annex*] and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [*resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex*], and as consecrated by two world conferences—the first World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held at Geneva from 14 to 25 August 1978, and the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held at Geneva from 1 to 12 August 1983—as well as by the relevant General Assembly resolutions, especially resolutions 35/33 of 14 November 1980 and 34/24 of 15 November 1979—all those concepts and principles have not changed, and cannot be changed or altered by anything other than the complete eradication of racism and racial discrimination in all their forms, including zionism, and by the elimination of *apartheid*, which is practised by the South African authorities.

29. At that time my delegation expressed its dissatisfaction for, and even deplored, the plan submitted by the Secretariat on the activities to be undertaken by the Secretary-General during the period 1985–1989 [*A/39/167 and Add. 1 and 2*], in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/14 of 22 November 1983, because it represents a departure from Economic and Social Council resolution 1984/43 of 24 May 1984, especially paragraph 3 thereof, which states:

> "*Requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session a revised plan of activities for the period 1985–1989, taking into account the priorities reflected in the Programme of Action for the Second Decade and the relevant resolutions and recommendations, including the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the programme of activities to be undertaken during the second half of that Decade, as contained in General Assembly resolutions 3057 (XXVIII) of 2 November 1973, particularly paragraphs 18 (*b*) and (*e*) thereof, and 34/24 of 15 November 1979;".[4]

The Secretary-General has indeed presented an amended plan, but has not referred to any activity against the racist practices of the Zionist entity towards the Arab population of occupied Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories.

30. My delegation is keen on seeing a transformation in all efforts aimed at destroying at least one of the two racist bastions in southern Africa, and it did not submit any amendments to the resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted. We believe that every reference to racism inevitably encompasses zionism, which the Assembly has considered as a form of racism. The expression "occupied territories" inevitably includes the occupied Arab territories of Palestine, Jerusalem, the Golan and the West Bank. Every reference to United Nations bodies and organs inevitably includes the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories and the Committee on the Exercise of the

Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. On this basis, my delegation decided to join the consensus on this draft resolution. My delegation had hoped that the draft resolution would be approved without any reservation from any side, hoping that that would help the victims of *apartheid* in Africa. But that did not happen.

31. Mr. RAY (United States of America): My delegation wishes the record to reflect the fact that the United States did not participate in the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/39/656. The United States is not participating in the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and has not participated in the consideration of agenda item 86 for well-known reasons which were most recently explained when the draft resolution was recommended for adoption in the Third Committee.

32. Miss AL-TURAIHI (Iraq): When we joined the consensus on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report [*A/39/656*], it was with the understanding that all declarations and resolutions of the Assembly, and decisions of the international conferences organized during the first Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, are applicable to the first and Second Decades, including Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) of 10 November 1975, which considered zionism as a form of racism. The struggle against racism and racial discrimination must be included in the plan of activities for implementing the Programme of Action for the Second Decade, so as to conform with the relevant resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council. It is also our understanding that "occupied territories" means the occupied Arab territories.

33. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to 5 minutes for the second and should be made by representatives from their seats.

34. Mr. SUFOTT (Israel): My delegation had not wished to do anything to impair the efforts of the African sponsors of the draft resolution to advance the real purposes of the Second Decade. Abuse of the first Decade has already produced the most ill-conceived of all United Nations resolutions, Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), the infamous resolution equating zionism with racism. That same abuse has again thrust itself upon us this afternoon, contrary to the paramount interest of a united effort and unity of purpose. There are Governments represented in the Assembly which have demonstrated in their explanations of vote that they would sacrifice or subordinate to their own narrow political interests the cause of this Decade.

35. This resolution, which has been adopted by consensus, calls for action against *apartheid*, against racism, against the racial genocide of the Kurdish people in Syria and in Iraq, against the almost complete annihilation of the Assyrian Christians in Iraq, against the disfranchisement of the Christians of Syria in the 1962 census and against their persecution and the horrendous racial barbarities perpetrated against them and against Jews, among others, in Syria—Jewish men, women, girls, incarcerated, raped, murdered.

36. A distinguished Middle East journalist has recently commented that one could take all the human rights of Iraq and place them on the head of a pin and there would still be ample room left for the human rights of Syria. It is an honour to be the object of attack by such régimes and systems. Strictures such as we have heard from Governments such as these are pure praise. We need no other evidence of the decency of our cause.

37. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I do not want to dwell on this matter at length or to hamper the work of the Assembly, but I would like to remind the representative of the Zionist entity of the programme presented by the Jewish American journalist, Mike Wallace. The representative should remember this and remember what Wallace said about the status of the Jews in Syria. I do not know if the representative recognizes that there are Arabs in occupied Palestine and knows whether they have any rights.

38. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take up the report of the Committee on agenda item 87 [*A/39/657*]. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

39. Mr. PASTOR (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): When the Third Committee voted on draft resolutions A/C.3/39/L.7, under agenda item 84, and A/C.3/39/L.3, under agenda item 87, we abstained, because the texts contain, although in a milder form, certain elements that are an affront to many countries whether from the east, the west, the north or the south. We consider also that the draft resolutions do not sufficiently emphasize the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. We still have the same reservations and think that those texts could be improved upon. Honduras, however, will vote in favour of both draft resolutions before the Assembly, as it did a few minutes ago with regard to the draft resolution under agenda item 84 since, despite what we have said, they contain many objectives that are compatible with the principles of our foreign policy as described repeatedly in the Assembly. I refer to the principles concerning the struggle against colonialism, *apartheid* and racism, the rejection of the occupation of territories by force and support for the self-determination of peoples, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and reflected in the draft resolutions.

40. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): My delegation supports, and will continue to support, the general thrust of draft resolutions aimed at expressing the dissatisfaction of the Assembly with the policies of the Government of South Africa in Namibia and its imposition of the system of *apartheid* in South Africa. This support, however, does not imply that we are in full agreement with all the provisions of the draft resolutions or, indeed, with the language used in those draft resolutions.

41. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report [*A/39/657*]. Draft resolution I is entitled "Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, Portugal, Spain.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 121 votes to 17, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/17).[5]

42. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/18).

43. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Committee on agenda item 88 [*A/39/658*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 15 of its report. Draft resolution I is entitled "Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/19).[1]

44. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/20).

45. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination". A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 2 of draft resolution III. If there is no objection, the Assembly will first vote on that paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 2 of draft resolution III was adopted by 123 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.

46. The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has also been requested on paragraph 3 of draft resolution III. If there is no objection, the Assembly will now vote on that paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Paragraph 3 of draft resolution III was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

47. The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has also been requested on the following part of paragraph 12 of draft resolution III: "including information on the demographic composition of their population and on their relations with the racist régime of South Africa". If there is no objection, the Assembly will now vote on that part of the paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

That part of paragraph 12 of draft resolution III was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.[6]

48. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution III as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 145 votes to 1 (resolution 39/21).[1]

49. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Committee on agenda item 85 [*A/39/655*]. The Assembly will now proceed to take decisions on the two draft resolutions recommended in paragraph 14 of that report.

50. Draft resolution I is entitled "International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/682. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/22).

51. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Efforts and measures for securing the implementation and the enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to education and work", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/23).

52. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up the report of the Committee on agenda item 89 [*A/39/659*] and take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/24).

53. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the report of the Committee on agenda item 90 [*A/39/660*] and take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Question of aging", recommended in paragraph 8 of that report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/25).

54. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take up the report of the Committee on agenda item 91 [*A/39/661*] and take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons", recommended in paragraph 11 of that report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/684. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/26).

AGENDA ITEM 31

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;

(*b*) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

(*c*) Report of the Secretary-General

55. Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset I should like to express to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic our condolences on the death of its Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Aleksei Vatchenko. On behalf of my delegation, I request the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to transmit our sincere condolences to its Government and its people and to the family of the deceased.

56. Once again the General Assembly is considering the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. Although the United Nations has concerned itself with the question for so many years, the situation in South Africa is deteriorating, acquiring tragic new dimensions.

57. Since the beginning of the discussion of this question in the United Nations numerous resolutions have been adopted. The international community has made several appeals, all of which have gone unheeded by the Pretoria régime, a régime which has persisted in its practices and its defiance of the international community, thus proving its utter disregard of the United Nations and its resolutions.

58. At the very moment when we are discussing this subject, the racists in South Africa are mounting ferocious and criminal repression against the black majority, depriving them of their legitimate political and social rights, reducing the population to silence by brute force and the imprisonment of thousands of young men, women and the elderly.

59. The Pretoria régime's repression is not confined to South Africa. In fact it has used every possible means in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia through acts of terrorism and murder against the heroic people trying to break away from the shackles of political slavery imposed upon them by this régime.

60. The South African régime is carrying out its plans by deporting Africans to barren areas in order to force them to live in conditions of poverty and disease, with a view to transforming South Africa into a white man's land and depriving the black majority of its citizenship rights, in order to consolidate its racist control over the entire country and continue its Fascist rule in opposition to growing national resistance and the forces of national liberation.

61. The immoral racist practices of the South African authorities against the black majority give the peoples of South Africa and Namibia the right to carry on an armed struggle with every possible means in order to confront these criminal practices, as well as the acts of brutal repression and genocide commit-

ted by the racist rulers in Pretoria and detention and arrest under arbitrary laws.

62. In its attempts to mislead the international community regarding the true nature of its recent reforms, the racist régime has announced the implementation of the so-called constitutional reforms to give the right to self-determination to the so-called three peoples, but the real objective is, first, to keep the majority of the South African population excluded from the political process and, secondly, to co-opt some segments of the population with a view to promoting the policy of *apartheid*, the continuation of exploitation and the defeat of the struggle for liberation. There is no doubt that the imposition by the racist régime of the so-called new constitution represents blatant defiance of the international community, with serious and far-reaching implications for the already explosive situation in that part of the world.

63. It is regrettable that, although the racist régime in South Africa is continuing its racist policies, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its aggression against the front-line States, as well as its defiance of the United Nations resolutions, it is still enjoying the support and co-operation of some Western countries. Their military and economic support has enabled the racist régime to blackmail anti-*apartheid* forces and encouraged the Pretoria régime to persist in its racist policies and its colonization of Namibia. Those countries are co-operating only on the basis of their narrow self-interests, completely disregarding their international and humanitarian responsibilities. Some of those States, speaking in the General Assembly, use language which suggests an interest in and sympathy with the efforts of the majority to eradicate the crime of racial discrimination and even show enthusiasm for the resolutions condemning the racist minority régime in South Africa, but in fact that position is only for propaganda purposes and is not based on a sincere desire to eliminate *apartheid*.

64. With regard to the support received by the racist Pretoria régime contrary to resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, I should mention the alliance that has evolved between the two racist régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv, with their continued aggression against the African and Arab peoples. Their co-operation in all fields is continuing, especially in the military, strategic, cultural and economic fields and in the propaganda field. This co-operation is no secret, and the representative of Israel cannot deny it. The world in general, and Africa in particular, knows full well who is openly collaborating with the South African régime, supporting that régime militarily and increasing its capabilities with a view to enabling it to suppress and oppress the struggling African people. At previous sessions the General Assembly has called upon Israel to end all forms of collaboration with the Pretoria régime, especially collaboration in the military and nuclear fields, and to comply with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Instead of complying with those resolutions, Israel persists in its collaboration, thus entrenching and supporting the Fascist racist régime in South Africa.

65. Iraq and the other Arab countries that participated in the Conference of Arab Solidarity with the Struggle for Liberation in Southern Africa, held at Tunis from 7 to 9 August 1984 [*see A/39/450, annex*] and in which all African liberation movements participated, re-emphasized the basic principles of true solidarity with the people of South Africa and expressed sincere support for the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia against racism and colonialism. That Conference showed the magnitude of the solidarity between the Arab people and the African peoples and their common willingness to continue the struggle until the defeat of racism and colonialism in all their forms.

66. At that Conference, which was attended by Iraq and all the other Arab countries, petroleum companies were condemned for their attempts to break the oil embargo imposed on the South African régime. That Conference also re-emphasized the importance of complying with resolution 26/5, concerning the oil embargo, which was adopted in May 1981 by the Council of Ministers of the Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries.[7] This fact is mentioned as a clear answer to the allegation made the other day by the representative of Israel [*69th meeting*], in an attempt to cover up the ignoble collaboration, known by all, between his entity and the racist régime of Pretoria.

67. *Apartheid* is not only a violation of human rights but also a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security, and thus it should be eliminated by every possible means under the Charter of the United Nations. The ending of the policy of *apartheid* and colonialism in South Africa and Namibia requires further concerted international efforts in parallel with the intensification of the struggle against the repressive Fascist racist régime in South Africa. This requires the imposition of comprehensive sanctions under the Charter against the racist Pretoria régime to compel it to renounce its racist policies and to withdraw from Namibia. We believe that those who frustrate the Organization's efforts will bear a terrible historical responsibility.

68. All States Members of the United Nations should give their full support to this cause and should not rest until the *apartheid* system in South Africa has been eliminated. My delegation pledges itself to make every effort in that regard, and once again reaffirms its unswerving support for the liberation movements in South Africa.

69. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): Let me first of all join all my colleagues in expressing shock at the passing of the Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. My delegation takes this opportunity to convey its condolences on this sad loss to the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR, and, through it, to the Government and people of the Ukrainian SSR and to the bereaved family.

70. There is hardly any issue before the Assembly that evokes as much emotion or greater anger and frustration than that of the inhuman system of *apartheid*. Correspondingly, few issues have brought the international community to such complete agreement on their condemnation and total rejection. Yet *apartheid* is still in existence, its perpetrators unrepentant and indeed obstinate and contemptuous of the world body. Last year, just before the Assembly took up this item, the international community stood by in apparent helplessness as the racist régime put into effect yet another measure aimed at entrenching and buttressing the system of *apartheid*. Save for the verbal condemnation of the so-called constitutional reforms imposed upon the people of South Africa, no action was taken. Just a few weeks ago the Assembly

witnessed yet another in the series of so-called constitutional dispensations being put into effect. Again the Assembly rejected it as another ploy in the service of *apartheid.* But to the extent to which *apartheid* endures, to the extent that it demonstrates arrogance and contempt for the international community, it bespeaks the failure of the Organization to take effective action to eradicate it. This current session of the General Assembly, therefore, could use this as an opportune moment for us to address ourselves to concrete measures that would help the people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle for emancipation.

71. That *apartheid* is evil is not in question. The General Assembly has ruled it a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security. It is in the context of this consensus that the international community has taken measures and made significant progress not only in sustaining the campaign to isolate the régime but also in galvanizing the struggle inside South Africa.

72. Over the last year significant progress has been made on the political front. Campaigns of mobilization for the boycotting of the *apartheid* régime have gained fresh momentum as the world has become more aware of the atrocities of *apartheid.* The Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, and the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, reiterated the commitment of the international community to the eradication of the system of *apartheid.*

73. Yet the repeated condemnations of the policy of *apartheid* and the measures adopted and appeals launched by the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] and the United Nations to bring racial conflict to an end have all been rejected arrogantly by the racist régime. The measures so far taken, separately and collectively, by Member States have not brought about peace in South Africa.

74. The international community rightly rejected the establishment of the so-called tricameral parliament, which the racist régime had hoped would involve the so-called Coloured and Indian communities in the *apartheid* structure. But not even the appearance of some non-white individuals—and the clear success of the boycott campaign proves that they are no more than that—as members of the so-called parliament alters the basic truth. The *apartheid* structure remains unchanged. Twenty-three million black people are disenfranchised. It remains a fact that in South Africa politics, economics and other institutions are based on race. The system of racial registration, the Group Areas Act, the racial education and health systems and all the other basic pillars of *apartheid* are not affected. The removals policy is being ruthlessly applied. A million people are threatened with relocation, in addition to the almost 4 million who have already been uprooted from their homes. Bantustans—which have been rejected by the international community—are being entrenched in an attempt to divide the opposition to *apartheid* and to confuse *apartheid*'s external opponents.

75. While the people of South Africa have totally rejected this façade of change in South Africa, the detractors of African freedom have seized upon the events to seek to ease pressure on the régime, on the excuse that the régime, a surrogate of imperialism, has embarked on the so-called road to peaceful change. Their economic greed and ideological fixations have propelled them into a new era of alliance with the *apartheid* régime.

76. Constructive engagement and its philosophical considerations and content have proved to be inimical to the interests of the black people of South Africa. The period of constructive engagement has meant only comfort and support for the racists in South Africa and, correspondingly, oppression and death for the black people. The policy has reinforced *apartheid.* Need we recount the many vistas that have opened of co-operation with the régime? Need we recall the billions of dollars that have been pumped into the *apartheid* economy, the new diplomatic, military, nuclear and political links being forged between some Western countries and the racist régime, or the consistent negative votes in the Assembly and in the Security Council on draft resolutions to ensure the elimination of *apartheid*? The fact that the indefensible policies of aggression of the *apartheid* régime are now being rationalized or put into contexts far removed from the realities of racial tyranny in South Africa bespeaks the reluctance of some countries to accept the evil nature of *apartheid.*

77. South Africa has repeatedly tried to mask its aggression, claiming that it is the object of external attack. We hear an echo of this ridiculous claim from its friends, which have all of a sudden discovered that it is the so-called cross-border violence which precipitates South Africa's acts of aggression.

78. It is clear that the arrogant attitude of the régime, its consistent defiance of the will of the international community and of the relevant United Nations resolution, and its incessant breaches of the rules of international conduct would not be possible were it not for the close co-operation and support of some Western countries. Verily, the *apartheid* régime has become the surrogate of those countries.

79. The record stands. South African troops have conducted repeated and unprovoked military attacks on Mozambique, Lesotho, Botswana and Zimbabwe. They have invaded Angola and remain in occupation of parts of that country. We have heard the excuse in the case of Angola that cross-border violence had provoked the invasion and that the military operations were directed against the militants of the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*]. Tremendous pressure is being applied against Angola, and underlying all this are efforts to force Angola to concede to unacceptable conditions for the withdrawal of those occupying forces. Yet ironically we hear no concern about South Africa's violence. The proponents of the so-called constructive engagement have not demonstrated regard for the sovereignty, territorial integrity or independence of Angola, a Member State of the Organization. Rather, they have joined the *apartheid* régime in further oppressing the oppressed. As regards Mozambique, the focus of all these attacks has been infrastructure, communications and other essential economic facilities for the purpose of terrorizing the people of Mozambique. In all these cases, South Africa has been encouraged to embark on destabilization. It has used political intrigues and economic pressures and, whenever necessary, created armed groups of saboteurs and

other bandits to operate within the territories of its neighbours, all with a view to neutralizing the external opposition to *apartheid*. To us, that is the essence and effect of constructive engagement: to construct political systems in the countries surrounding South Africa that are not only acceptable to South Africa and its friends but are less hostile, if not sympathetic, to *apartheid*.

80. In the Declaration on Southern Africa made by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twentieth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa, it is underlined that:

> "Africa is committed to resisting, and ultimately defeating, the efforts to force our countries into any relations with racist South Africa. We shall resist the economic, political and military pressures which are being used by South Africa and its friends to terrorize, intimidate and blackmail individual African countries and to reduce still further their freedom of action".[8]

81. What needs to be emphasized is that any contacts with the South African régime made necessary by history and geography should not be seized upon by the enemies of Africa to justify opening up for and embracing the *apartheid* régime. On the contrary, the continuation of these contacts is a reminder that the international community has been found lacking in its support of the countries of southern Africa.

82. That the *apartheid* régime is now prepared to talk to the Governments of the countries of southern Africa, which it sought to liquidate only a few years ago, is in itself a demonstration of the failure of the régime to subdue them. Yet we reject the premise of these so-called olive branch initiatives, for *apartheid* cannot offer peace to the black people outside South Africa while massacring those inside its borders. It is an absurd proposition. We hold the view that the *apartheid* régime must settle with the people of South Africa and not seek scapegoats outside. Those close to the régime could help if they chose to see the reality and not circumvent it. We hope those same countries will impress upon their surrogates in Pretoria to follow this course. The régime must release Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners who are languishing in the jails and dismantle all institutions of *apartheid* if it desires peaceful change.

83. The *apartheid* régime may have modified its tactics inside South Africa, but nothing has changed. The petty and cosmetic changes that have supposedly taken place have been lauded by the friends and apologists of *apartheid* as signalling a positive movement towards the democratization of South Africa. We have been told to be patient while the racists in South Africa ponder on the direction of change, as though the suffering, the maiming and the killing of the black people were so unimportant that it can wait indefinitely. But clearly, it is no longer possible for the whites of South Africa alone to determine what kind of change will take place, when it will take place and to what end.

84. In sum, we reject the assertions of those who raise their voices against alleged occasional violations of human rights—which fade in significance when compared to *apartheid*—but who demonstrate such cruel disregard of the suffering of the black people in South Africa. We are equally not impressed by their claim that *apartheid* will be eliminated by creating jobs for the black population, as though finding work were more important or immediate to a slave than regaining his freedom. At issue in South Africa is not jobs but the struggle for the abolition of the instruments and institutions which degrade the humanity of man. We reject the assertion that *apartheid* can be reformed or made more acceptable. *Apartheid* must be eliminated in its totality.

85. Equally we reject any suggestion of neutrality to racism, let alone its appeasement. *Apartheid* represents the total negation of our common humanity which our adherence to the Charter of the United Nations enjoins us to safeguard. That is a responsibility enjoined by the Charter, and the whole world, in particular those more powerful among us, have the duty to ensure that evil does not endure, let alone be provided with its sustenance.

86. The agonizing question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the atrocious policies of *apartheid* must be squarely addressed. *Apartheid* constitutes permanent aggression against the people of South Africa. The General Assembly has judged the system to be a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security. It is the system of *apartheid*, its acts of terrorism, destabilization and aggression that is the sole obstacle to freedom, peace and security in southern Africa. Hence, we call upon the Assembly to continue to demand the institution of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. In the meantime, Tanzania continues to believe that the total isolation of *apartheid* South Africa is a necessary component of the campaign to force that régime to abandon its obnoxious policies. To do so, a global campaign must be sustained to ensure that the régime does not find comfort. In this regard, we were encouraged by the massive demonstrations by the anti-*apartheid* forces in Europe against the visit early this year of Botha, the racist representative, to certain European countries. We condemned the visit then and regret the fact that those countries did not find it possible to sustain the international quarantine of the *apartheid* régime. Let me take this opportunity, on the other hand, to express our satisfaction with the actions of the present Government of New Zealand, among others, to contribute to international efforts against *apartheid* in all its manifestations. The actions of the new Government of New Zealand are indeed most encouraging.

87. Within the context of international solidarity against *apartheid*, my country had the privilege of hosting the Conference on Southern Africa organized by the Socialist International Committee on Southern Africa and the Socialist Group of the European Parliament from 4 to 5 September this year. The Heads of State and Government of the front-line States participated in the Conference. In reiterating its commitment to the elimination of *apartheid*, that Conference concluded in its communiqué that:

> ". . . *apartheid*, a crime against humanity, is at the root of the problems in southern Africa and has been entrenched further in South Africa . . . It is clear, therefore, that South Africa's policies are a threat to international peace and security. There will be no real peace in southern Africa until *apartheid* is eradicated. Today, the *apartheid* structure remains unchanged and the so-called reforms have only strengthened this evil system."

88. The Conference further reiterated that:

"Not until real change takes place, that is, the destruction of the system of *apartheid* and separate development, can South Africa have a place in the family of nations. South Africa is trying to destabilize neighbouring countries. This may affect political relations in the region but that does not mean others can use this as an excuse for passivity in the common struggle against *apartheid*. By various means South Africa must be isolated in order to keep up pressure for real change."

My delegation wishes to reiterate that position.

89. I would be remiss if I did not pay a deserved tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and in particular to its Chairman, Mr. Garba. The leadership he has given to the work of the Committee underlines his personal commitment to freedom and justice and also that of his country, Nigeria, which has been at the forefront in the struggle against *apartheid*.

90. I also wish to convey our appreciation of the work of the Special Committee. Its world-wide campaigns of mobilization against *apartheid*, its programmes, in particular the campaign for cultural and sports boycotts, the release of political prisoners and disinvestment have begun to take root. In this regard my delegation commends those individuals, institutions, organizations and countries which have been supportive and urges them to endeavour to do more.

91. Of course our own efforts would have been in vain had they not been complemented by the struggle of the people of South Africa themselves, who even in the face of death have continued to challenge the régime. Their constant sacrifice has been recognized by the international community. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Bishop Desmond Tutu was a recognition of the legitimate struggle of the South African people. Their unrelenting dedication to their own freedom has reinforced our own.

92. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): Before I speak on the agenda item which is now before the Assembly I should like to add my voice and that of my delegation to those who have spoken before me and express our condolences on the death of the Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Aleksei Vatchenko, and I would request the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR to convey our sorrow and sympathy to his family and to the people and the Government of the Ukrainian SSR. May he rest in peace.

93. The General Assembly is once again debating the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa against the background of relentless terror and violence that makes the behaviour and practices of the Hitlerite Nazi régime of the 1930s and 1940s appear to be a lesser evil on earth. As we once again express our outrage at the practices of *apartheid* we find ourselves alarmed by the echoes and shadows of horror, as seen, heard or read through the daily news media, emanating from the never-ending atrocities inflicted on the black South African majority.

94. The free and freedom-loving world, which could apply leverage on the South African régime, is duty bound in the name of humanity and human rights to side with those in South Africa whose daily lot has become an everlasting struggle which they wage in the most unfavourable environment for the exercise of the inalienable rights bestowed on them by the Almighty.

95. It is high time for the freedom-loving world to express itself in support of this struggle and bring the political, economic, social and diplomatic pressure to bear on South Africa in order to secure peace and security in that region.

96. How long, we ask, can a small, white, selfish minority keep the vast majority of black South Africans in bondage, hem them in on all sides and deprive them of their most elementary human rights? For how long, and at what level and manner of persuasion, can this minority treat the overwhelming black majority as subhuman beings, unworthy of a decent livelihood?

97. Students of elementary natural laws believe that those short-sighted Afrikaners who enjoy the huge wealth of South Africa in a disproportionate manner should know that they cannot retain that privileged position indefinitely. Cognizant of that fact, the *apartheid* policy teaches that in order to extend the term of their privileged position the racist régime of South Africa and its white minority proponents will need to compromise with their human conscience, if they imprison and deny the basic rights of those who challenge them peacefully and kill on a massive scale those who oppose them.

98. It is the spectre of *apartheid* which has made the territory of South Africa, despite its fertility, its huge mineral resources, wild life, abundant human resources and natural beauty—offset by man's unkindness to man—one of the unhappiest countries on earth, where inequality flourishes on the largest scale and acute injustice is enthroned and where the oppressor and the oppressed are in constant fear of spontaneous conflagration. This is because the vast majority of the black African nation has been denied equality in its own country. It has been subjected to the most extreme humiliation of segregation, racial discrimination and insult. The African individual has been denied even the barest recognition of participation in the government of his own country. Black South Africans are imprisoned without trial. They are tortured and killed in prison. Schoolchildren and their parents are killed in the streets in hundreds and thousands. Family members are scattered and condemned to oblivion. Black families are left to live in squalour in the black settlements. They are insulted, intimidated, and denied their legal rights. The houses of innocent families are broken into without any search warrants. Black political leaders are incarcerated. Black communities are separated and their children are segregated in education and merely prepared for servitude. Such is the depth of degradation inflicted on black South Africa under the *apartheid* régime.

99. Meanwhile, a tiny minority of less than 15 per cent arrogates to itself sole possession of the best 86 per cent of the South African territory and forcibly condemns the great majority of 85 per cent of black South Africans to bare survival in the unwanted and most barren 14 per cent of the territory, where they endure the most abject poverty and destitution.

100. *Apartheid* South Africa believes that the black race is incompatible with the white race and that no harmonious match, physically, culturally or socially can be achieved. It claims that African tribalism and white South African sophistication are like oil and water and must always remain separate.

101. Because of the arrogance and ignorance implicit in this argument, it needs no refutation. Implicit in the attitude of the racist régime, it negates common sense and belongs to the annals of Nazi philosophy. It is regrettable and unfortunate, however, that that attitude predominates and has provided the driving force in condemning the black African population to live outside the urban areas, where life has been made unbearable for them. Under this hideous policy of *apartheid* the black South African population has been forcibly settled in the most inhospitable areas now referred to by the racist régime as homelands and bantustans.

102. A black South African is destined at birth to belong to a homeland and thus becomes internationally stateless, deprived of his or her right to nationality, contrary to article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

103. Homelands are in the middle of nowhere. Some of them are little blocks of separate territory completely isolated in the midst of South African land and having no communication whatsoever with each other. Bophuthatswana, for instance, is made up of different pieces of waste territory and a citizen of that so-called State has to travel across South African territory to get from one part of it to another. Electricity, water and other public services and amenities have to come from the mainland and can be cut off with great ease.

104. The grand *apartheid* policy designed for the homeland inspired in the South African régime the misguided hope that all the blacks of South Africa could be relegated eventually to a defined territorial area, leaving the great bulk of South Africa as white territory. The failure of the grand *apartheid* homeland policy, however, becomes clear when the total inability of the South African régime to move over 10 million black Africans from urban areas to the homelands is realized.

105. *Apartheid*, which has no backing of moral authority, as a result of the gathering storm of resistance and opposition emanating from community organizations, workers and their unions, students and religious institutions, as well as growing international condemnation, now tends to gain support from its military arm which, although it cannot maintain the régime indefinitely, can inflict heavy blows on the struggling black South Africans and the neighbouring States that have been extending moral and material support to the freedom fighters in South Africa.

106. South Africa's relations with its neighbours and its criminal acts of intensified terrorism and armed aggression against the neighbouring front-line States of southern Africa have become unbearable. The covert manoeuvres of the South African régime and its collaborators threaten the security of the front-line States and should be condemned and halted through the collective efforts of the peace-loving forces of the international community before the already tense situation in the area explodes into a serious conflagration.

107. The South African *apartheid* régime, bent on its policy of intimidation, oppression, exploitation and dispossession of the South African black majority, has chosen the military option to subjugate this majority, and has thus intensified its efforts to achieve its evil design by increasing its military expenditure 45-fold, or 4,500 per cent, since 1961. It is also known that the South African régime has acquired nuclear-weapon capability.

108. Confronted with moral bankruptcy and strong resistance from the masses, the *apartheid* régime has not balked at any measures to escalate its obnoxious military and police violence and intimidation. As a result, tension, violence and mass destruction of life and property have become the order of the day. The Pretoria régime arrogantly ignores all international appeals, including the decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, to change its *apartheid* practices. Faced with this dangerous and defiant behaviour, the world community will need to take concerted international action to prevent the subsequent escalation of violence to a wider international conflict. The international community, in taking action against *apartheid*, should seriously consider all aspects of socio-economic and military sanctions, including the full and effective implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa, and especially action to prevent it from acquiring further nuclear-weapon capability, as called for in General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and decisions.

109. The so-called new constitutional reforms have created a spectre of violence and terror throughout South African territory. When the *apartheid* régime defiantly embarked last September on the introduction of the so-called new constitution, which demonstrated yet another odious aspect of its policy of racism and racial discrimination and segregation, the whole South African black and Coloured community rose in revolt against it. These so-called new constitutional reforms have led to yet another strategy of confrontation which have opened the door to intensified violence and police brutality directed against the black majority of South Africa. They have resurrected the old policy of divide and rule and made a mockery of the normal democratic process as we know it.

110. We were pleased to learn, however, that the elections to the so-called tricameral parliament in accordance with those constitutional reforms met with a complete boycott and non-participation by all the Coloured population. The shameful and humiliating defeat thus inflicted on the *apartheid* policy is clear proof of the prevalence of popular support for and desire for the victory of the struggling black majority of South Africa.

111. We find the so-called new constitutional reforms and the manoeuvres under them no more than a new phase and new ramifications of *apartheid* and believe that they should be condemned and declared null and void.

112. We were glad that the General Assembly rejected the so-called constitutional reforms in its resolution 38/11, and that both the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the *OAU* rejected and condemned them.

113. The important role played by international conferences in highlighting the great dangers the *apartheid* policy of South Africa poses to southern African States is a great contribution to the efforts to safeguard world peace and security. However, conclusions or decisions adopted at these conferences will have no effect in combating and eliminating the system of *apartheid* unless individual Governments are compelled to respect and implement them.

114. We commend the efforts of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, which, under the leadership of Mr. Joseph N. Garba of Nigeria and in pursuance of General Assembly resolutions 38/11 and 38/39 A through K has repeatedly drawn the attention of the international community to the serious situation in southern Africa resulting from the aggressive policy of the South African régime.

115. We are gratified to note with appreciation the active role the Committee has played to gain worldwide support for the global mobilization of action against *apartheid*, as effectively expressed at regional conferences convened in Africa, Asia, Latin America and North America. We also commend the Committee's efforts in promoting action on specific aspects of the campaign against *apartheid* and in establishing task forces on women and children under *apartheid*, on political prisoners and on legal aspects of *apartheid*.

116. The delegation of Djibouti fully concurs with the conclusion of the Committee and accordingly supports its recommendation.

117. We call upon all Governments and other institutions of the international community to cooperate in efforts to mobilize effective solutions against the South African régime and to continue to provide all necessary assistance to the people of South Africa and their national liberation movements.

118. With international solidarity and the active support of all freedom-loving nations, we look forward to the day, which is not far off, when majority rule will triumph and the African masses will form their own Government representing a free, non-racial and democratic society.

119. Mr. MAZARI (Pakistan): My delegation also wants to join members in offering our sincere condolences on the sad demise of Mr. Vatchenko, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

120. The odious and immoral policies of *apartheid* of the South African régime is once again the subject of debate in this thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. Unfortunately, South Africa's pursuit and practice of this abhorrent philosophy has been as vigorous during the year under review—if not more so—as in earlier years.

121. The year saw South Africa's crude attempt at deceiving its people with the promulgation of a so-called new constitution and the holding of managed elections which were conducted under martial law conditions and marked by widespread public protests in the country.

122. In its consideration of the situation in South Africa, the Assembly reaffirmed, in its resolution 39/2, that "only the total eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial democratic society based on majority rule, through the full and free exercise of adult suffrage by all the people in a united and unfragmented South Africa, can lead to a just and lasting solution of the explosive situation in South Africa". The resolution also rejected South Africa's so-called new constitution as a further entrenchment of *apartheid* and condemned the racist régime for perpetuating a system that was "a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security". But no indictment, however intense, has had any effect on the obdurate rulers of South Africa.

123. Chapter III of the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22*] gives a detailed and factual account of South Africa's acts of repression against its own people. It also documents the resistance struggle against the régime by the people of South Africa. South African workers and students, supported by the angry masses and church organizations, are involved in an underground armed struggle against the Government in power. We have read also of developments relating to South Africa's military build-up, its acquisition of nuclear capability and its acts of aggression against its neighbours. No other régime anywhere in the world is as culpable of so many diverse crimes as is the South African régime.

124. Pakistan has since its very inception remained staunchly committed to the eradication of *apartheid*, which is abhorrent to the concept of universal brotherhood and equality enshrined in its Islamic ideology. In a message expressing solidarity with the political prisoners of South Africa last October, President Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan said:

> "Belief in the equality of man is the corner-stone of the faith of the people of Pakistan and the policy pursued by the Government of Pakistan. Racial discrimination is anathema to Islam and to Pakistan, and we have always considered it our sacred duty to provide full support to all victims of the abominable policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all its manifestations."

125. In another message of solidarity with the struggling people of South Africa in June this year, our President said:

> "In reaffirming their solidarity with the people of South Africa, the Government and the people of Pakistan renew their pledge to extend all possible assistance for the complete eradication of *apartheid*, which constitutes a crime against humanity and a threat to world peace. We are convinced that the day is not far when the valiant struggle of the people of South Africa for freedom, equal rights and human dignity will be crowned with success and racial oppression will be eliminated from the face of the earth".

126. *Apartheid* cannot be reformed and must be totally destroyed. This is a task that can be accomplished only by a collective and determined effort on the part of the international community. We express our complete solidarity with the Special Committee's recommendation that the international community should urgently adopt a strategy for decisive action to secure peace and freedom in the region.

127. To this end the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations will be imperative. Meanwhile the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa imposed under Security Council resolution 418 (1977) should be strictly enforced. Accordingly, the Pakistan delegation fully endorses the recommendations made by the Special Committee in its report to the General Assembly. We are confident that the struggle of the valiant people of South Africa for equality and human dignity will soon be crowned with success.

128. Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): One of the first actions of the current session of the General Assembly was to adopt on 28 September last resolution 39/2 on the situation in South Africa, a situation which remains serious because of the tide of bloody and

deadly repression inflicted by the Pretoria racist authorities on the black majority population in imposing their so-called new constitution.

129. This so-called new constitution has been condemned by the international community. Security Council resolutions 554 (1984) and 556 (1984) and General Assembly resolutions 38/11 and 39/2 have clearly and categorically rejected this so-called new constitution and quite rightly declared it to be null and void. It is in fact nothing other than a manoeuvre to have us believe that the *apartheid* régime has become more flexible in its position, whereas in reality it is only trying to strengthen white minority power and *apartheid*.

130. This so-called new constitution, conceived in accordance with principles of racial segregation, makes so-called Coloured people and people of Asian origin second-class citizens, and makes the black population, which represents more than 70 per cent of the total population, non-persons. Therefore, 24 million blacks, already deprived of their rights, have become non-persons in their ancestral home, in accordance with the logic of *apartheid*.

131. If this so-called new constitution was rejected and condemned by the international community, it was above all rejected, condemned and fought by the overwhelming majority of the South African people. The massive boycott by the Coloured and Asian communities of the recent "elections", and the heroic struggle of the black population against this so-called new constitution, are proof positive that a large majority of South Africans said no to the so-called new constitution, as it has always said no to *apartheid*.

132. But instead of hearing the voice of reason of the international community, and preferring to be blind to blatant reality in South Africa itself, the Pretoria racist régime continues to defy Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and has imposed implementation of this so-called new constitution by force. To do this, it has in fact established in South Africa a situation of martial law in order to facilitate the brutal repression of the black population. The events of the last three months in South Africa have shown that Pretoria has not hesitated to resort to violence and murder against defenceless demonstrators and striking workers, to arrests and arbitrary imprisonment of leaders and activists of mass rallies, or to the closing of schools and universities. The racist authorities have even resorted to intimidation and repression on a large scale, as was the case in Sebokeng, which has added another name to the list of martyred cities such as Sharpeville and Soweto.

133. The past year has also witnessed other criminal activities of the Pretoria racist régime as part of its continued policy of bantustanization and forced expulsion of the black population from their homes and lands. Pretoria is even contemplating proclaiming the so-called independence of another bantustan, the Kwa Ndebele. If that is the case, this would be the fifth independent pseudo-state. The international community also readily rejected, and has not recognized, the first four bantustans and it will not fail to do the same for the fifth, because everyone knows that the policy of bantustanization is only designed to deprive black Africans of their property, their roots and their nationality.

134. Every time we consider this agenda item, we always bear in mind the fact that the Pretoria racist régime also applies its inhuman policy of *apartheid* in Namibia, which it continues to occupy illegally, and also its acts of aggression committed against neighbouring States.

135. My delegation recognizes the sovereign right of independent States to pursue a policy in accordance with their national interests. Nevertheless, the international community should refrain from doing anything that might encourage the Pretoria régime to pursue its unjust and inhuman policy of *apartheid*.

136. In this connection, my delegation would like to express its solidarity with the people and Government of Lesotho in defending their national interests in the face of pressures brought to bear by the South African authorities.

137. The General Assembly and the Security Council have always advocated a reasonable way to solve the problem under consideration. They have just reiterated this in paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 556 (1984) and in paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 39/2, which read:

> ". . . only the total eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial democratic society based on majority rule, through the full and free exercise of adult suffrage by all the people in a united and unfragmented South Africa, can lead to a just and lasting solution of the explosive situation in South Africa;".

This is the only way that the evil will be rooted out.

138. The delegation of Democratic Kampuchea would like to avail itself of this opportunity to express once again its firm support and fraternal solidarity with the heroic struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and its liberation movements: the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania [*PAC*] and the African National Congress of South Africa [*ANC*] for a democratic society without distinction as to race or colour. This struggle, waged with immense and prolonged sacrifice, should also be part of the annals of the struggle to defend the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, and the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

139. What do South African blacks want? In order to answer this question, my delegation believes that Bishop Desmond Tutu, the Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, duly reflected the opinion of the black majority in South Africa and of the African continent, as well as that of the international community as a whole, when he stated, on 23 October last, before the Security Council that "blacks are not intent on driving whites into the sea, but on claiming their rightful place in the sun in the land of their birth."[9]

140. It is our bounden duty to do our utmost to see to it that these legitimate claims are met.

141. May I, by way of conclusion, pay tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and, above all, to its Chairman, Mr. Joseph Garba of Nigeria, for the constant efforts they have made to mobilize world public opinion and to denounce, condemn and end the inhuman policy of *apartheid* as pursued by the racist régime of Pretoria. My delegation would like to give assurance of its support to the Committee in carrying out its noble mission.

142. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): It was with a deep sense of shock and grief that the Ghana delegation received

the news today of the sad passing away of the distinguished Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Aleksei Vatchenko. With your permission, Mr. President, I wish to extend to the Government and people of the Ukraine, and to my colleague, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, and his entire staff, our sincerest condolences on this sad loss.

143. My delegation welcomes the opportunity to participate today in the debate on the *apartheid* policies of South Africa, because it concerns the denial of fundamental human rights to South Africans and especially because the events in that country are becoming increasingly more ominous for all races there, as well as constituting a threat to international peace and security.

144. It is almost 40 years now since the United Nations was founded, and the question of *apartheid* as practised by the racist Pretoria régime has been on the agenda of the Organization for almost as long. The main reason for the failure so far to find a solution to the problem has been the extraordinary length to which some friends of South Africa are prepared to go to protect that culprit régime. It is ironic that those countries which provide protection for the racist régime through the regular use of their veto powers in the Security Council and through other subtle forms of solidarity are the same States which passionately profess support for the Charter of the United Nations and for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

145. Once again the Assembly must address the serious situation in South Africa as it has the ingredients of a threat to international peace and security. But we are entitled to ask whether there has been any change in the South African situation since the debate last year. The only change that has occurred unfortunately has been one for the worse, thus negating all the progress of the past. The so-called constitutional reform has only enabled the racist régime to entrench *apartheid* through further establishing by law that 73 per cent of the black population shall continue to be disenfranchised. This legislation therefore contravenes the provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and should be vigorously condemned and opposed by all Member States.

146. The continuing deterioration of the situation in South Africa brought about by increasing brutality and treachery and manifested in the Pretoria régime's policy of *apartheid*, especially in the last 12 months, remains a source of great anxiety to the Government and people of Ghana. It is our view therefore that the situation deserves more than the casual attention that some Member States habitually give it.

147. In spite of the numerous resolutions of the Assembly and of the Security Council, as well as those of other United Nations forums, and notwithstanding the international abhorrence of the *apartheid* policy of the South African Government, the international community is repeatedly being treated with utter disdain and arrogance by the Pretoria Government. Its unco-operative attitude is clear when it obstinately persists in the practice of a system rightly acknowledged by the international community to be a crime against humanity and an affront to the conscience and dignity of mankind. Is it not time to call a halt to South Africa's offensive arrogance, therefore, to ensure justice and equality for all South Africans and save the reputation of the Organization?

148. It is well over two decades now since the Special Committee against Apartheid was mandated to work to raise international awareness of the evils of *apartheid*, with a desire to bring international pressure to bear on the South African régime to change its policy. As can be ascertained from its reports, the Special Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph Garba of Nigeria, has over the years performed most creditably within the terms of its mandate. But, while the international anti-*apartheid* campaign grows in intensity, we also witness more repression in South Africa as well as more subtle efforts to entrench *apartheid*. The reasons for this trend are not very far to seek. The South African régime is emboldened to pursue its obnoxious *apartheid* policy in total defiance of international public opinion because of the support the régime continues to receive from certain Western countries. It would thus seem that the perennial consideration of the item by this body is degenerating into an intellectual exercise with nothing being achieved concretely in the direction of bringing our hopes for a non-racial democratic society in South Africa to fruition.

149. I should like to devote a moment to the phenomenon of the overt support that certain Western countries give to the racist régime, because the protests of those Western friends of South Africa at being identified as collaborators with South Africa have recently reached a shrill pitch as they trudge many capitals in defence of their unacceptable policies. They insist that we clothe in anonymity their activities in support and encouragement of the racist régime. We are being vigorously persuaded to agree that there is merit in their call for the forging of intimate relations with the racist régime when we can all see that the result of their efforts is the calamitous killing of more and more people in the streets of South Africa. Only the politically naive can agree with them for they have indeed become the interlocutors of the racist régime against all enlightened advice. If truly they are for the same goals as we pursue and are only adopting a different methodology to achieve them, I challenge their representatives to come to this rostrum and openly declare in this forum that they support the immediate establishment of the system of one man, one vote, in South Africa and that, as genuine and influential Members of the United Nations, they will not accept anything less. Our partners in the West must understand that their inability openly to support for South Africa a principle upon which their own democracies are founded does injury to their credibility.

150. Guided by history, the delegation of Ghana is convinced that the great strides made in increasing international awareness about the crime of *apartheid* have sufficiently eroded the fraudulent basis upon which the *apartheid* philosophy was nurtured. It is a trend which confirms the historical fact that any system based upon a fraudulent premise must necessarily crumble. We are hopeful that with the struggle against *apartheid* in the form it has taken in recent times the racist régime of South Africa is going to be swept away. It is an obvious historical necessity from which nobody can escape. We therefore wish to renew the appeal to the friends of *apartheid* to be faithful to their conscience and the principles upon

which their own systems have been established—principles on which was based their indignation against the Nazi and Fascist threat to Europe not too long ago—to help bring the *apartheid* régime to its knees.

151. Members of the Assembly are very much aware of the atrocities that the *apartheid* régime of South Africa must necessarily unleash on its black citizens as well as its neighbours in order to continue in existence. The régime's bantustan policies with their attendant forceful removals of millions of black people from their ancestral homelands, their moribund constitutional reforms aimed at redefining *apartheid* in a manner that can only entrench a racially segregated society, their enforcement of the notorious and despicable pass and terrorism laws and their acts of aggression, massive destabilization, terrorism and economic blackmail against neighbouring independent African States all serve as pointers to the highly volatile character of the situation in southern Africa.

Mr. Farah Dirir (Djibouti), Vice-President, took the Chair.

152. The policy of *apartheid* is a violent policy and it is no surprise that its enforcement has to be effected through violent means. Yet the black and oppressed South Africans have never relented in their heroic resistance to *apartheid.* The successful opposition to the cosmetic reforms recently introduced by the racist régime through the promulgation of its new constitution deserves special mention. It not only has disappointed the régime's apologists in the United States and other Western countries who sought to gain some political points by citing the so-called reforms as the internal evolutionary process they have all along said *apartheid* would undergo in the application of the constructive engagement policy, but has further demonstrated the tenacity of purpose within the national liberation struggle inside South Africa. Over 70 per cent of South Africans, smarting under the yoke of *apartheid,* say *apartheid* cannot be reformed, it has to be eradicated, and we agree with them.

153. In this regard the delegation of Ghana cannot accept the respectability being accorded the white minority Government by certain Western countries, as exemplified by the official reception given to Prime Minister Botha by the leaders of Government in Portugal, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland, Italy and even the Vatican in the summer of this year. P. W. Botha and all that he stands for should remain in isolation, and all countries genuinely committed to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should condemn his reception.

154. We must mention also that the recent so-called peaceful accords entered into by South Africa and some of its neighbours under the prodding of the creators of the constructive engagement policy do not enjoy our support; nor have they altered our fundamental view that the policies of the racist régime are contrary to the Charter and must therefore be repudiated. These accords have been designed by P. W. Botha and his friends to satisfy the hegemonistic objectives of South Africa and its friends in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*], thus dragging the whole southern African issue, which should rightly be a matter of universal human rights, into the cold war.

155. The recent change in relations between some front-line States and South Africa has been used to boast of the kind of success inherent in greater interaction with the racist régime. But two things are clear about these recent far-reaching changes in relations. In the first place, the reversal of policy indulged in by some front-line States represents a military truce—indeed, a military surrender—and has nothing to do with the anti-*apartheid* principle. Secondly, the colonial integration of the economies of the front-line States with that of South Africa limits their sovereignty and freedom in the matter, but is no reason why the principle of the equality of races should be suspended in South Africa. We are emboldened by our sense of propriety to answer our Western friends, especially those in the United States, by saying that accords resulting from South Africa's international State terrorism cannot enjoy our patronage. The United Nations was founded to achieve peace, and their attitude will help endanger peace in that part of the world.

156. Furthermore, it ought to be clear even to the apologists for the racist régime that the mandate for the so-called new constitution at which we are being asked to rejoice was at best the squeak of a die-hard minority in that country. On 22 August 1984, when the first voting was held, a massive number of the 2.7 million registered voters not only stayed away but protested at the elections, leading to hundreds of arrests and detentions. Vast majorities of both the Indian and the Coloured community refused to register and vote. Only 20 per cent of the Indian voters and only 30 per cent of the Coloureds turned out at the polls. Six hundred and thirty thousand coloured students boycotted classes on that day. The Indians also registered only 7 per cent to 23 per cent at the polls. In no way, therefore, can the result represent a resounding endorsement of the goals of the new constitution. On what moral grounds, then, does Washington describe the proceedings as a "step in the right direction"? It is Washington, therefore, that must revise its views, not those that condemn the so-called constitution and *apartheid.* Those that condemn the so-called constitution are right. The express denial of the vote to the black majority cannot be a step in the right direction.

157. The stage reached in the international attacks on the *apartheid* policy of the South African Government is most critical, and the delegation of Ghana renews its commitment to the noble cause. It is now time to focus all energies on the adoption of concrete steps in addition to the numerous resolutions of condemnation that the Assembly has adopted and is going to adopt during this session.

158. Ghana fully supports the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter and recommends the vigorous pursuit of the Programme of Action against *Apartheid,* commended by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/39 B. We give our support to these measures in the full knowledge of their very serious repercussions for South Africa and for the international community. We believe that we are unable to condone the continuation of *apartheid* in one form or another even for one more day, because every day constitutes racial injustice to the black majority of that country. We agonize also with our black brothers and sisters because, in a way, their

continued oppression detracts from our own freedom and human dignity. In the circumstances, no tendentious theories satisfy us as a panacea for the insult to our dignity. Sanctions represent an effective and peaceful instrument for inducing meaningful change, and we invite all States to join in their institution.

159. On a concluding note, let me reiterate Ghana's unflinching commitment to the international efforts to eradicate *apartheid.* We have been so committed from the first day of our independence, and we will continue to be so. We wish to pay a tribute to the suffering and dispossessed masses of South Africa who have dedicated their lives to the elimination of a system that threatens the very roots of humanity. Ghana remains solidly behind the national liberation movements leading the struggle against the *apartheid* régime and wishes to request material and political support from the international community so that those movements can carry on more expeditiously their struggle for their freedom and independence as well as for the total emancipation of the continent of Africa from racial oppression and colonial domination. We hope that we can rely on this.

160. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): The delegation of Zimbabwe has learned with the deepest sorrow and sympathy of the demise of the Head of State of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. I extend my delegation's deep sympathy and condolences to the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR and, through it, to the Government and people of that country. Our deepest sympathy and condolences go also to the family of the late Head of State.

161. Since 1946 the Assembly has been concerned about the racial policies of the Government of South Africa. Since then important decisions and resolutions on this subject have been adopted, and continue to be adopted, by both the General Assembly and the Security Council. And yet *apartheid,* as the system of the government of South Africa is called, continues unabated. In fact, the more the international community tries to end that country's archaic and barbaric policies, the more the white minority rulers in Pretoria attempt to fight against the march of human history and lead the country backwards from the twentieth century. The principles of justice, liberty and equality for all men and women, regardless of the colour of their skin, are anathema to the racist rulers of Pretoria.

162. The black people—or, as they are called by their oppressors, non-whites—are denied every right, including citizenship, simply because of the colour of their skin. Instead, numerous laws are imposed upon them, essentially to control and exploit their labour for the benefit of the white minority rulers and exploiters. A massive bureaucracy and police and military machines are maintained to ensure the efficient brutalization and dehumanization of the exploited masses of the black people of South Africa. Simply because they are not white, these people are denied all sorts of human rights which most of us, and all the civilized world community, tend to take so much for granted.

163. One of the chief designers of the policies of *apartheid,* and a former Prime Minister of that racist country, once explained the evil and barbaric philosophy behind *apartheid* in the following terms: "We want to keep South Africa white. Keeping it white can only mean one thing, namely, white domination, not leadership, not guidance but continued white supremacy". This was said by Hendrik Verwoerd.

164. Yet the *apartheid* system continues. In fact, some countries regard *apartheid* South Africa as an ally and a bastion of Christian or Western civilization. By implication, therefore, such defenders of the régime also view the exploited and oppressed masses, who have decided to fight for their liberation and freedom, as criminals and enemies of so-called Western and Christian civilization. For us, however, the struggling oppressed are freedom fighters and defenders of human dignity. Their struggle is justified under the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. If they have taken to armed struggle, it is because every possible channel for achieving peaceful change has been brutally denied them. The current acts of brutality and murders committed by the racist régime's repressive police and military machines in black townships are eloquent testimony to this.

165. As we in Zimbabwe are convinced of the legitimacy of the struggle for freedom and self-determination by the oppressed masses of South Africa, we also join those who have appealed for increased international solidarity with, and moral, material and other forms of support for, the people of South Africa. Accordingly, we are encouraged by the positions adopted by the Assembly every year, including the characterization of *apartheid* as "a crime against humanity". We are also encouraged by the Assembly's rejection on 28 September this year [*resolution 39/2*] of the so-called constitution of South Africa, thereby reaffirming an earlier Security Council resolution declaring that instrument null and void.

166. We believe that *apartheid* should not be modified. It should be courageously opposed and totally eliminated. The so-called new constitution is not designed to eliminate, or, for that matter, even to change, the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa. Its objective is to entrench and perpetuate *apartheid.* Frustrated by the massive rejection of the so-called constitution by the oppressed and exploited masses, and by the international community, the régime has unleashed terror and repression against innocent black workers, community leaders and students in South Africa. Again, we unreservedly condemn those acts.

167. On the regional front the régime is intensifying its campaigns of economic sabotage and blackmail, brutal and blatant aggression and destabilization against its peace-loving neighbours, in a vain hope to intimidate them in such a way as to stop them supporting the struggling peoples of South Africa and Namibia and also to establish its regional hegemony. Recently the racist régime's leaders have not only been bragging and boasting about their position as a regional military super-Power but also threatening to demonstrate this against those States refusing to normalize relations with Pretoria. We reject those threats, just as we condemn and reject the policy of recruiting, training, arming and sponsoring counter-revolutionaries, mercenaries, bandits and dissidents against neighbouring States in the region.

168. The racist Pretoria leaders must be told in very clear language that neither their ferocious and repressive domestic policies nor their nakedly aggressive regional policies and acts of blackmail can for ever halt the tidal wave of freedom and justice in South Africa. The legitimacy of the struggle of the op-

pressed people of South Africa for the full exercise of their right to self-determination and the establishment of a non-racial democratic society, as reaffirmed recently by the Security Council in its resolution 556 (1984), will, and must, come sooner rather than later.

169. Any realistic search for solutions to the dangerous situation in South Africa must involve the oppressed people of South Africa, through their legitimate leaders and liberation movements, such as the ANC and PAC. In this regard, the delegation of Zimbabwe is distressed to observe that some Western Governments do not seem to appreciate fully the importance of this approach, as is clear from the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22, paras. 329-351*]. Moreover, some countries have sought to justify their collusion with Pretoria with totally unacceptable arguments, such as the argument that too much isolation of, or pressure on, the régime will only make Pretoria adopt more of a laager mentality or position.

170. If the opposite of this argument is that without pressure the Boer rulers will abandon their laager and accept change, then we are compelled to ask how much real change has taken place in South Africa since the introduction of the policy of constructive engagement? The answer is none. Instead, the policy seems to have given solace to Pretoria in the ruthless pursuit of its barbaric policies and practices. In fact, Pretoria has even been encouraged to induce or even compel neighbouring countries to enter into unequal agreements, or non-aggression pacts, as they are sometimes called. South Africa has no reason to fear, even to imagine, that any of our countries in the region could commit aggression against its territory. The rulers of Pretoria know this full well; so also do their Western allies. Let South Africa desist from its aggression against its neighbours and address seriously and genuinely its domestic policies, and peace will immediately come to the region, to the benefit of us all.

171. Economic and military collaboration with Pretoria and Israel by some Western countries ensures the perpetuation of the policies of *apartheid* in South Africa. Transnational corporations which continue to reap profits from their South African investments must know that they are acting against the interests of the oppressed South African masses. Such co-operation with *apartheid* impedes progress towards the achievement of their aspirations to freedom, social justice and the full exercise of self-determination.

172. For our part, in accordance with our commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter, we in Zimbabwe will co-operate in all genuine efforts totally to eradicate the scourge of *apartheid* from South Africa. We shall continue our solidarity with and support for the struggling South African and Namibian masses until true freedom, self-determination, social justice and equality are achieved in those countries of our region.

173. In conclusion, I wish to express my delegation's richly deserved tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, under the dynamic and imaginative guidance of Mr. Garba, the representative of Nigeria, for the work that Committee has been doing. My delegation fully supports the Special Committee's recommendations and pledges its full and continued co-operation with it.

174. Mr. SOLOMON (Ethiopia): Allow me to associate myself with the speakers who have preceded me in conveying, on the occasion of the passing of the Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the most sincere condolences of my delegation to the Government and people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, as well as to the bereaved family.

175. It is indeed paradoxical that *apartheid*—based as it is on inequality, oppression and exploitation—could still survive in this age in which new frontiers of knowledge and enlightenment are being opened up and the world community is striving for the attainment of international harmony and understanding and the establishment of a new economic and social order based on equality and justice.

176. Today *apartheid*, which is supposed to promote the separate development of the races but which in actual fact is an institutionalized system of racial segregation, oppression and exploitation, enables the white minority of South Africa to control the destiny of the black majority. In South Africa a person's racial classification is all-important, since it determines his worth as a human being. For a non-white, *apartheid* determines where he may live, what work he may do, what sort and level of education he can receive, what political rights, if any, he will have, the extent of the social, cultural and recreational facilities open to him and generally the extent of his freedom of action and movement.

177. Blacks in South Africa are torn from their land and driven into arid tribal reserves which comprise only 13 per cent of the land surface. In order to earn a living they have to go to white industrial areas as migrant workers only. Furthermore, they are subjected to innumerable discriminatory laws. If such a system, which degrades the worth of human beings, is not a crime against humanity and a grave menace to international peace and security, then what else can be?

178. The struggle against *apartheid*, therefore, cannot be a struggle to reform a system but must be one to destroy it. It is not a struggle of blacks against whites but a struggle by all democratic and freedom-loving people against racism. Indeed, it is a struggle of all those who believe in peace, justice, human rights and human dignity.

179. The United Nations has discussed the policy of *apartheid*, in one form or another, for decades. The Assembly has declared the policies of *apartheid* "a negation of the Charter of the United Nations and . . . a crime against humanity" [*resolution 2671 F (XXV), para. 1*]. It has, furthermore, affirmed the inalienable right of the people of South Africa to self-determination and freedom and the legitimacy of their struggle to eradicate *apartheid* and racial discrimination by all available means. It has also rejected and condemned the establishment of bantustans and the forcible removal of blacks to those areas as a violation of their inalienable right to self-determination and prejudicial to the territorial integrity of the country and the unity of the people.

180. In practical terms, unfortunately, all the decisions of the United Nations have not compelled the racist régime to change its policy and obnoxious practices. Of course, most of the countries of the world have already severed all relations with the racist régime of South Africa, yet the most important

ties that régime has with the Western world are still intact. Despite the repeated calls by the General Assembly for the total isolation of South Africa, the Western world, regrettably, continues to collaborate with the *apartheid* régime in political, economic and military as well as in nuclear fields.

181. In this connection, we have to reaffirm our conviction that the policy of so-called constructive engagement has failed to convince the Pretoria régime to change its ways. On the contrary, all indications are that Pretoria has been emboldened and reinforced by that policy. As a result, we invite the United States Administration to review its policy and perhaps consider a policy of constructive disengagement, which we are confident will bear better results.

182. Within the Republic of South Africa itself, the racist régime is doing everything in its power to entrench further the obnoxious policy of *apartheid*. While continuing to deny the African masses their fundamental human rights and freedom, the *apartheid* régime has in recent times been attempting to entice the so-called Coloured and Asian population with constitutional subterfuges and meaningless political reforms.

183. I submit that the so-called new constitution is nothing but the latest in the series of legal frauds presented to the world by the racist régime in Pretoria. Inasmuch as it excludes the black majority from any share in the Government of South Africa, it cannot but be a reaffirmation of Pretoria's bantustanization policy. Furthermore, it attempts to drive a wedge between the black majority on the one hand and the so-called Coloureds and those of Asian origin on the other, in the hope of weakening the liberation struggle of the oppressed masses as a whole.

184. This latest machination of Pretoria has, of course, misled no one, least of all the so-called Coloured people and the people of Asian origin. We are indeed heartened to learn that many from those two groups have rejected the new proposals and that the international community has not been hoodwinked by this fraud either.

185. The black people's massive and vigorous opposition to this constitutional fraud and the brutal retaliation perpetrated by the South African régime against freedom fighters, students and journalists represent a new stage in the struggle of the South African people for freedom, and an inescapable challenge to the international community. Encouraging as it is, such resistance by the oppressed must be complemented by sufficient pressure from the outside world, especially from those countries which are collaborating with South Africa.

186. Ethiopia believes that the United Nations has a special responsibility to the oppressed people of South Africa. We believe it is that responsibility that led to the creation of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. In this connection, we wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Chairman and all the other members of the Special Committee as well as to the United Nations Centre against *Apartheid* for their invaluable contribution to the liberation struggle in South Africa, a contribution they make by keeping the question of *apartheid* high on the international agenda.

187. I should like also to reiterate Ethiopia's deeply-felt frustration at the failure of the Security Council to adopt effective enforcement measures under the Charter against the Pretoria régime in order to facilitate peaceful change. As we all know, the failure of the Security Council and the defiance of Pretoria are due to the diplomatic, political, economic and military support that that régime receives from certain Western States. Without that support, *apartheid* South Africa could hardly have survived for so long. It is with this conviction that we in Africa have so often and so insistently appealed, as we continue to appeal, to the sense of justice and reason of those Western Powers. If those few Western States refuse to heed the voice of reason, then they will very soon have to reckon with the consequences of armed struggle.

188. The *status quo* in South Africa, from which the West has continued to reap immense profits, cannot and will not last forever. The racist, oppressive and exploitative system of *apartheid* will eventually be demolished by the popular resistance of the masses, whose struggle continues to gather momentum with each passing day and whose commitment and determination will in the end prove more potent and decisive than the nuclear capabilities of the fascist régime. We therefore call once more upon the Western Powers concerned to join us in our efforts to rid Africa and the world of the racist scourge that is *apartheid*.

189. Mr. SOGLO (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I wish first of all to discharge a very unhappy duty. We heard with sadness of the death of Comrade Aleksei Vatchenko, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. I take this opportunity to convey to the Ukrainian delegation our deepest condolences.

190. Is the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa still to be put on trial? Is it still to be put on trial after 70 years of crimes and treachery, after it has ousted an entire people from its ancestral lands, stowed it away in bantustans, looted its wealth, humiliated it and dehumanized it? If there is yet to be a trial, it can be only in the court of the international community, of those who—wittingly or through cowardice—have not desired justice to be done for the black people of South Africa.

191. In fact, the trial of the policy of *apartheid* of South Africa is not yet to be carried out: that policy has already been condemned before history and before the Organization. It has been condemned on moral and legal grounds, condemned on the grounds of equity and civilization. It is a crime against humanity. That is the verdict of the entire international community.

192. After the Sharpeville and Soweto massacres, the South African régime revealed to the world its hideous face. Even those who have not determined to end their blameworthy relations with this loathesome régime try to justify them with quibbles that they do not themselves believe; indeed, they declare their hatred for the régime.

193. But at this very moment this policy—unanimously condemned and universally abhorred—is terrorizing and killing with such savagery and hatred as have rarely been equalled. The black people of South Africa are counting their dead in the hundreds, even in the thousands, following the demonstrations that in recent weeks have shaken the dormitory-towns of the African townships.

194. These events have shown the truth to those who refused to believe that *apartheid* could not be reformed and that only its total elimination would bring peace and harmony to a land which has suffered too much the torments of racism and racial discrimination.

195. The so-called constitutional proposals, adopted a year ago by an exclusively white electorate, which were to permit the Asian and Coloured minorities to participate in the political life of the country, will not prove to be what has been called "a step in the right direction". The "new constitution" resulting from those proposals will turn out to be just one more villainous law in the arsenal of repression and in the denial of the most fundamental rights to the black people of South Africa. The General Assembly has seen in that constitution nothing but a manoeuvre to fragment the black population and to persuade the Coloured and Asian minorities to co-operate with the régime in order to perpetuate the system of white domination. That is why the Assembly, in resolutions 38/11 and 39/2, and the Security Council in resolution 554 (1984) rejected it as being contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and declared it, therefore, to be null and void.

196. The tragic events which for several weeks have been occurring in South Africa—the general strikes, the riots, savagely repressed by the South African soldiery—show if such were necessary that dialogue and collaboration which certain countries stubbornly maintain with that régime have not had the expected redeeming virtue. In fact they constitute an out and out denial of the virtues of the policy of so-called constructive engagement.

197. The indictment of the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa is also an indictment of all of those who bring it aid and assistance, enabling it thus to maintain itself in power. It is also an indictment of those who help it in its heinous policies, in its arrogant refusal to conform to the decisions of the Organization and to the desires of the whole international community. It is an indictment of those who in the Security Council oppose the adoption of appropriate measures, these being the only ones which might be such as to bring the Pretoria régime to reason, namely, the imposition of global and binding sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It is an indictment of those who are concerned above all to preserve their privileged commercial relations, their military and scientific relations, which they maintain with Pretoria and who, in so doing, have contributed not only to the pillage of the natural resources of the country but also to the acquisition by the illegal South African Government of nuclear weapons, enabling it to intimidate and terrorize its neighbours.

198. The indictment of the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa is also an indictment of those who do not dare to raise their voices to oppose these acts of aggression, of massive destabilization, of terrorism and of economic blackmail to which the Pretoria régime resorts against its neighbours. The agreements giving itself the lion's share which it has imposed on certain of its neighbours have been possible only by virtue of the connivance or even the blessing of certain Western countries. It is also an indictment of those who, playing South Africa's game, agree to receive the racist Pik Botha in official or private visits, thus giving aid and comfort to the efforts which that régime is vainly deploying to find a way out of its isolation. It is also an indictment of Israel which shares with this régime the same policy based on terrorism and aggression.

199. The indictment of the policy of *apartheid* of the South African régime is also an indictment of those who, by cupidity or cold calculation, give aid and comfort to the South African illegal occupation of Namibia. The stubbornness of South Africa in its flouting of the unanimous decisions of the Organization is explicable only through the complicity of certain Western Powers who, in connivance with it, shamelessly exploit the Namibian people and implacably pillage its resources.

200. This indictment is finally and above all of the United Nations and more particularly an indictment of the Security Council, which has not yet managed, six years after its adoption, to implement resolution 435 (1978) leading to the independence of Namibia. The inability of the Security Council to implement its own resolutions can only discredit an organ of the United Nations whose responsibility of maintaining international peace and security is being permanently tested by the crimes of Pretoria.

201. *Apartheid* is a monstrous crime. It is so monstrous that it sometimes succeeds in shutting the eyes of certain people to the original crime of the usurpation of the land of South Africa and of power there by a minority of unprincipled expatriates from Europe.

202. As can be seen, it is no longer a time for empty condemnations; it is more than ever time for action which we must undertake to eradicate this scourge. While stating here our confidence in the armed struggle being carried on by the liberation movements of South Africa and by SWAPO, we want to urge the Organization once again, and more particularly the Security Council, finally to adopt more decisive measures against the Pretoria régime.

203. The Special Committee against *Apartheid*, under the guidance of its Chairman, Mr. Joseph Garba, has competently and objectively discharged its task. As it has so well stressed in its report, "International action must not only match the greater danger posed by the action of the *apartheid* régime, as well as the courage and heroism of the oppressed people, but must be directed at the total eradication of *apartheid* with no further delay." [*Ibid., para. 296.*]

204. Mr. BAYONA MEDINA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me first to say how much we valued the statements made in this Hall by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports.

205. My delegation is taking part in this debate to reiterate its commitment to joining its efforts to those of the international community to achieve our common aim of eliminating *apartheid*. Our position is based on the conviction that respect for fundamental human rights is a guarantee of peace, and on the mandate of Peru's Constitution, which declares that all men are equal before the law without distinction as to sex, race, religion, opinion or language. Likewise, we reject all forms of imperialism, colonialism and racial discrimination and express our solidarity with the oppressed peoples throughout the world. A faithful interpretation of this principle cannot be of

greater significance in a multiracial country such as Peru.

206. *Apartheid* is one of the most distressing problems facing southern Africa. Another is the illegal occupation of Namibia, with the perpetual danger looming over the borders and territories of the young Republics neighbouring on South Africa. This panorama of constant crisis affects the regional peace of the African continent which it is the responsibility of this international community to safeguard.

207. Institutionalized racism in South Africa is the lot of approximately 25 million inhabitants. If we think that out of the 159 nations represented in this Assembly only 30 have a population greater than the figure I have just mentioned, we can appreciate the true magnitude of this tragedy.

208. In South Africa we are facing a kind of contemporary colonial conquest. The indigenous majority has seen its ancestral lands wrested from it and has been transferred *en masse* to other regions so that the minority which holds power can occupy the best land and exploit the richest natural resources. That majority has no access to Government and no other rights are granted to it so that the difference between the conquerors and the conquered may be clearly established. In a word, we seem to be blowing the dust off the pages of an old history book and re-enacting in the atomic age, one of its most sinister chapters. In the case before us the process of occupation and conquest begun by the so-called "white African tribe" of Afrikaners in 1652 when they reached the southern end of the black continent is being intensified at this late date.

209. However, throughout history there has been one constant in this process of conquest and colonialization: the oppressed peoples have ended by freeing themselves, however powerful the oppressor. We do not have to look outside Africa for examples; that continent has many, and not very far from the borders of South Africa. Hence, it may be affirmed without reservation that the oppressed majority of that country will once again prove the truth of that constant. The people of South Africa is an heroic people, filled with zeal for liberty. Its courage is measured by the fierceness of its struggle against a powerful police and military apparatus which has been set up to ride roughshod over its claims and in response to the danger which that struggle represents for the continuance of the system in power.

210. In this Hall much testimony has been heard from freedom fighters from among the black people of South Africa who have served long, hard prison sentences. Today the prisons of South Africa continue to hold many of their companions. It is clear that the series of sentences pronounced cannot condemn the black majority to the chains of oppression for ever, particularly when in these trials the white majority in power acts as judge and jury. That is why we call on the international community to step up its efforts to bring about the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and put an end to all repression against those who are fighting against *apartheid*.

211. A year ago the South African Government, in a fresh attempt to undermine the struggle against *apartheid*, obtained from a majority of the white minority in a referendum approval of constitutional reforms by which the Coloured and Asian populations would be granted very limited participation in Government matters, while the black population was wholly excluded and disregarded. These political provisions do not change any of the basic features of *apartheid* and are aimed only at dividing the groups that make up the alienated majority. The response received by the Pretoria Government in the elections of August 1984 could not have been more significant. On the one hand more than 80 per cent of the people whom those constitutional reforms were supposed to benefit did not vote and on the other the protests of the black population were felt throughout the whole territory. At the international level, the Security Council, of which my delegation is a member, adopted resolution 554 (1984), in which it strongly rejected and declared null and void the so-called new constitution and the subsequent elections and urged all Governments and organizations not to accord recognition to the results of the elections.

212. During the months of May and June this year Prime Minister Botha made a well-publicized trip through various Western European countries with the obvious aim of demonstrating to the international public that South Africa was not isolated. To those who hoped that this trip would be a success it should be pointed out that it gave Botha the chance to observe at first hand that the international rejection of the policy of *apartheid* is not a mere invention of the United Nations or the result of an automatic ganging-together of a majority of countries manipulated by interests foreign to the purposes of the Charter. In point of fact, the streets of the cities he visited were filled with demonstrators protesting against his presence, showing him that repudiation of the practice of *apartheid* and the illegal occupation of Namibia was widespread and not confined to any political party. On the contrary, as far as we know there were no similar groups going out into streets to express their support for the racist policy of his Government.

213. In this connection I must point out that my delegation, as a member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, had the opportunity of attending a seminar on the practice of *apartheid* and the illegal occupation of Namibia, held last October in the Federal Republic of Germany, where representatives of the various European anti-*apartheid* movements gathered. On that occasion we were able to observe the concern felt by the European public, and particularly by young people there over the maintenance of this practice in southern Africa and the existence of a colonial régime in Namibia. Furthermore, we could not fail to notice the sound and thorough knowledge of this problem on the part of the participants and their sincere desire that the countries of Western Europe and others should make a constructive and decisive contribution to the cause of freedom in the south of the African continent.

214. The Latin American region is not unfamiliar with the struggle against the *apartheid* system. Proof of this is the success achieved by the Latin American Regional Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, held at Caracas from 16 to 18 September 1983. That Conference adopted by acclamation the Caracas Declaration on Measures against *Apartheid*.[10]

215. The Declaration expressed solidarity with the peoples of South Africa and Namibia and with the independent African States of southern Africa. It recognized the fact that stability and peace cannot exist in that region unless *apartheid* is eliminated. It affirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the South

African people to bring about the elimination of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial society which would guarantee the enjoyment of equal rights by all South African people, regardless of race, colour or creed. It urged the South African régime to put an end to repression, to free political prisoners, to repeal the law on illegal organizations and to seek a peaceful, just solution through negotiations with the genuine leaders of the oppressed people, and it urged all countries to use all their influence to ensure the achievement of that goal. The Conference declared that in view of the intransigence and defiant attitude of the racist régime the international community should apply pressure on that régime through sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

216. In conclusion, we must state that various events that have occurred in South Africa this year show that sectors of the majority seem to be inclining more towards armed struggle as a means of bringing about social change. There is no doubt that this trend will grow stronger as long as the Pretoria Government continues to step up its repression and refuses to dismantle *apartheid*. For that reason it is important to understand that the only viable solution to the problem under consideration is a peaceful transition to government by the majority within a free, democratic and multiracial society and that we must direct our efforts towards that goal.

217. Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Government and the people of Bolivia were profoundly shocked by the death of Mr. Aleksei Fedoseevich Vatchenko, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. We ask the representative of the Ukrainian SSR to transmit to his Government and to the family of Mr. Vatchenko the sympathy and condolences of my delegation and my country.

218. My delegation is taking part in the debate on this item to reiterate Bolivia's constant rejection of racial discrimination whether as an idea or as a practice, and more especially when such racial discrimination is the basis of a system aimed at perpetuating the exploitation of man by man.

219. *Apartheid* constitutes a crime against mankind and it is for that reason that the constitutional Government of Bolivia, faithful to the principles of democracy and of respect for human rights, last year deposited the instruments of accession to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [*resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex*]. That act was carried out in accordance with the traditional policy of the Republic of Bolivia which, since 1946, has expressed its repudiation of that disgrace to humanity which is *apartheid*.

220. My delegation cannot understand how for 38 years, the Republic of South Africa has continued to mock the international community, violating the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, without a fitting punishment that would bring it to modify its brazen behaviour.

221. There is no doubt that over those 38 years the international community has become fully cognizant of the significance of that sinister practice. This has been possible thanks to the efforts of the United Nations which has effectively responded to the mandate of the Member States to carry out this praiseworthy task.

222. However, it is not sufficient merely to have created an awareness of the problem. It is necessary for the international community to impose the principles of the Charter and to destroy this appalling scourge that has condemned the majority in South Africa to live in subhuman conditions.

223. How is it possible that at the end of the twentieth century we should still tolerate the idea that the South African majority can be shut up in bantustans like wild animals kept in reservations?

224. Hence my delegation once again expresses its total condemnation of the practice of *apartheid* and demands that the Republic of South Africa honour its international commitments set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights.

225. We wish to pay tribute to the South African majority on the heroic manner in which it is resisting the injustice of *apartheid*. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Bishop Desmond Tutu is universal testimony to the whole South African people and its martyrs in the struggle to achieve its most fundamental rights to freedom and equality.

226. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): We extend to the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic the condolences of the Government and the people of Viet Nam on the death of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Comrade Aleksei Fedoseevich Vatchenko. We also express our profound sympathy to the people of the Ukrainian SSR and to the family of the deceased on this sad occasion.

227. The appeal made by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, Mr. Joseph N. Garba [*66th meeting*], to all Governments and organizations, calling upon them to condemn the wave of killing and repression being carried out by the racist régime of South Africa, has placed at the forefront of the world's consciousness all the gravity of the escalation of threats to the fundamental rights of the people of South Africa, the stability of southern Africa and international peace and security.

228. My delegation has studied closely the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22*] and has listened attentively to the poignant and eloquent statements made before the General Assembly since last Tuesday, and we have nothing to add in the facts and the complete and detailed analyses which have been presented. We only wish to join our voices and our indignation in the universal condemnation of this monstrosity which is the régime of the racist colonialists in Pretoria—a monstrosity which still weighs heavily on international civilized society and the conscience of our time.

229. At the same time, my delegation takes this opportunity to express once again the vigorous support of the people of Viet Nam for the just and heroic struggle of the people of South Africa to rid itself of the yoke of *apartheid*.

230. Having had to endure colonialist domination, exploitation and repression for a long time, and having had to conquer and defend its independence and freedom in long wars of resistance, the people of Viet Nam is profoundly at one with the legitimate aspirations of the fraternal people of South Africa, and has every reason to believe in that people's final victory in its heroic struggle to overthrow the régime of *apartheid*.

231. This conviction is based on the following considerations of the analogy between the conditions of struggle of the two peoples.

232. In the first place, the struggle of the people of South Africa is at once a struggle of racial and national liberation, a struggle for the most fundamental human right, the right of a people to self-determination. Many preceding speakers have quite rightly stressed the essential identity between racial oppression and colonial domination, especially in a country like South Africa where, since 1948, a white minority has usurped all State power and subjected the overwhelming black and Coloured majority to complete domination.

233. Throughout the last 36 years the oppressed people of South Africa has steadily waged a struggle for its inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination, whose ultimate goal is to establish a non-racist, democratic State in South Africa. Confronted with the ferocious and inhuman brutality of oppression, the people of South Africa has not allowed itself to be intimidated and in fact has expanded and intensified its struggle.

234. At the present moment, this struggle has taken the form of resistance on the national scale, encompassing all levels of the oppressed population: workers, students, women, the young and the elderly. It has taken on the character of massive opposition and revolutionary violence against the barbarous, blind and desperate violence of institutionalized racism, which is in the process of turning into fascism and genocide.

235. In the second place, the experience of colonialism undergone by the Vietnamese people fully corroborates the observation often made during the last few days before the General Assembly to the effect that *apartheid* cannot be reformed and that the object of the struggle against this international crime must be its total suppression.

236. We have a saying in our country, which arose during the resistance struggle of the Vietnamese people against colonialism, to wit: "This monster does not change its nature, even if it is beaten to death". The more colonialism is subjected to the blows of popular resistance, the more it persists in its policy of "divide and conquer", setting up puppet administrations which help it to levy native troops to strengthen its capacity for terrorization and suppression. Such manoeuvres to divide people, with which our own people were very familiar, have been seen in recent years in South Africa in this farce of reforms and constitutional elections, in the reinforcement of the militarization of the *apartheid* régime and, as a logical consequence, in the increased terror and repression being carried out against the oppressed South African majority.

237. But why do these racist colonials of Pretoria not change their nature? Why, on the contrary, do they oppose popular resistance with added arrogance and ferocity? It is simply because these racists cannot cease exploiting the natural and human resources which are so abundant in South Africa, this exploitation being vital to their interests, to their very raison d'être. It is also because they have a sure and continuing guarantee of collusion and the interested support of powerful Western allies and Israel. This is indeed a plot, an alliance, a consortium of sordid political, strategic, economic and other interests, a sort of collective colonialism and neocolonialism with the United States and some other NATO Powers at its head. That is why Pretoria has been able to defy so insolently and blandly an impressive series of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as repeated appeals by the international community.

238. It is no longer the time for verbal declarations of denunciation and incrimination. It is to the great credit of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* that it dispensed with them in order to mobilize and increase international understanding, solidarity and assistance in the many-sided struggle for the elimination of *apartheid*. My delegation warmly congratulates the Committee, in particular its Chairman, on this fruitful work.

239. The Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Joseph Garba, has just launched from this very rostrum a vigorous appeal for concerted international action to accelerate total suppression of *apartheid*. We should respond to this appeal more effectively.

240. First of all, my delegation is of the view that we should redouble our efforts to isolate more effectively the *apartheid* régime in all areas—political, commercial, cultural, sports, strategic, military—and at all levels—global, regional, local—in various governmental and non-governmental organizations, in cities and villages, associations and corporations. In this respect, we must infinitely deplore the United States policy of constructive engagement, as well as the official visits by the boss of the *apartheid* system to certain Western European countries and to the Vatican, which have further comforted those criminals in their arrogance and boldness.

241. Next, we must considerably augment diplomatic and political pressure of States and international political opinion on the United States and other permanent Western members of the Security Council to ensure that they no longer impose their veto on comprehensive and obligatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter and to compel them to stop violating the arms embargo against Pretoria.

242. Finally, the community of States should more vigorously manifest its encouragement and provide increased assistance at all levels—political, diplomatic, material—to the courageous South African people, whose struggle is increasing in intensity. In this connection my delegation is happy to see that, tempered in new and unprecedented trials, the oppressed South African populations have stood their ground and reinforced their unity when confronted with tactics of division and intimidation. We warmly welcome the increasing strength of this organized resistance on the part of the South African people to repression, a resistance that testifies to the more effective political mobilization of the masses in step with an intensified armed struggle, in particular by the combatants of the ANC.

243. In conclusion my delegation would once more like to renew to the martyred South African people the expression of the Vietnamese people's militant solidarity. May it emerge from its present trials more battle-hardened than ever and better able to intensify its struggle in every possible way at its disposal because this will be the price of its final victory.

244. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Congo heard with consternation of the death of Comrade Aleksei Vatchenko, Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the

Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. We share the sorrow of the Ukrainian people at this sad news, but we know that they will bear it with courage. The life of Comrade Vatchenko was devoted to peace, progress and the well-being of the Ukraine and the great Soviet people as a whole. His loss is even more serious because we knew that he could have done even more for the just cause which he served so well all his life. We request the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to accept the condolences and the sympathy of the delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo.

245. The policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa is one of the problems of vital importance on the agenda of the General Assembly which cannot be approached without raising essential questions relating to the very nature of the human being and the moral bases of his behaviour.

246. So much muddle, so much shilly-shallying and so much cowardice have strewn the course of the relations between the *apartheid* régime and the rest of the international community, in particular the United Nations as the organ entrusted with promoting peace and harmony in the world, that at times one feels as much to blame as the Government of South Africa itself for the tragedy of *apartheid*, from which nearly 20 million people are suffering on a daily basis in their own country.

247. The entire world and almost all the world public have already condemned and continue to condemn racism, segregation and *apartheid* as a principle of government and a way of life. The number of speakers and the quality of their statements from this rostrum demonstrate, if demonstration is needed, the paradox of this situation, on the one hand there is unanimous condemnation, but on the other hand there is no action.

248. Is the world today so spineless, so blasé, that it can no longer distinguish between what is acceptable and what is unacceptable, between honour and shame? This is the outline of our preoccupation today.

249. What we cannot understand, after so many years of explanations and even of confrontation, is the role assigned to fear, fear which on the one hand influences the policy of the Government of South Africa and on the other neutralizes any positive action by other Governments, in particular the Western ones—with which, alas, Israel has fallen into step—and prevents any decisive action which might put an end to the racist experiment in South Africa.

250. This is a bitter comment but it should not leave us powerless; it only needed a few Sharpevilles or Sowetos for the *apartheid* régime no longer to have any claim on our conscience.

251. *Apartheid* remains a crime against humanity, therefore no man that cherishes peace and justice can rest until at last it is relegated to the same category of shameful memories as slavery, nazism and colonialism.

252. Two attitudes today govern the behaviour of countries regarding the *apartheid* régime. To the collaborationist attitude of those that conduct the policy of constructive engagement is opposed—not without justice—the attitude of the true democrats, who want to put an end to the long agony of the South African people and to promote in that country the reign of law, liberty and fraternity, without consideration of race.

253. The first thesis, that of the collaborators, is based on the pretext of the alleged progressive changes in South Africa, on which the allies of the Government of Pretoria, seduced by its propaganda, are counting.

254. Reassured by the benevolence of these latter, the white South African racists have never felt as comfortable as they do today. As proof of their understanding, their economic and commercial partners have redoubled their activities on behalf of the *apartheid* régime, which ensures a return of the order of 15 per cent on their investments, as against 8 per cent or 10 per cent in the United States or Europe.

255. As for military collaboration, it is no longer encumbered by moral or juridical considerations. The watchword today is defence of the so-called free world, of which South Africa constitutes a forward bridgehead, to the extent that it considers itself to be free, Christian and anti-communist.

256. Thus, by assuring South Africa of all the necessary power, certain Western countries have quickly gone back on the commitments they made in the Security Council not to export either arms or military material to that country.

257. It is no accident that the military budget of South Africa has increased by more than 21 per cent since last year. This militarization of the country relates as much to the activities of the secret police as to those of the ordinary police, making South Africa a veritable internment camp for the majority of the population.

258. Above all it should be stressed that this warlike frenzy is developing at a moment when the Government of Pretoria is proclaiming, in the interest of its contacts with certain front-line countries, its "concern for peace, stability and prosperity" in southern Africa.

259. The diplomatic offensive of Pretoria has gone still further. Its Prime Minister, Mr. Botha, was received officially in May and June of this year in certain capitals of Western Europe, including Rome, at a time ironically, when the victory over nazism was being commemorated.

260. In the People's Republic of the Congo, we are not deceived and we know how to distinguish a sincere desire for peace from publicity manoeuvres. The notion of peace has too much more practical content than that proclaimed by the *apartheid* régime for us to be mistaken.

261. What is the significance of a peace which is solely for export and designed to entrench internally the policy of fragmentation of the people under the slogan of bantustanization or the rationalization of *apartheid*?

262. The homelands policy, which is designed to deprive all blacks of their South African citizenship, is going full speed ahead. With the so-called independence of Kwa Ndebele next December, there will be five bantustans that will have acquired their pseudo-autonomy under the sponsorship of South Africa, which remains the only country to recognize them.

263. There is no need to stress here the drama of the millions of persons affected by the forced displacement consequent on the policy of bantustanization. Men are forced to spend 11 months out of 12 far from their homes; women are brutally prevented from living with their husbands; children are cruelly deprived of the affection of their parents.

264. Imperturbably pursuing the methodical establishment of its policy, the *apartheid* régime has proceeded this year to its famous constitutional reform, which has made the partisans of constructive engagement so much more forthcoming.

265. By its resolutions 554 (1984) and 556 (1984), the Security Council declared this alleged reform null and void. For its part, the General Assembly rejected it by resolution 39/2. In so doing, the United Nations, faithful to the mission entrusted to it in the Charter, ranged itself on the side of the majority, the 73 per cent of the population excluded from the benefit of this so-called reform, and thus gave accurate expression to the feeling of the majority of those involved in the electoral masquerade of last August, because only 20 per cent of them had given way to the pressure to participate.

266. It should also be remembered that only the white minority was asked on 2 November 1983 to approve the new constitution, and the three chambers—one for the so-called Coloured, one for those of Asian origin and one, the major chamber, for the white minority, which was to be given legitimacy by the first two.

267. These facts speak for themselves, and we need not dwell on their misleading character. The question which we ask is simply, as Frantz Fanon put it, whether we can "humanize repression". Should we try to get along with *apartheid* and consort with this régime or, on the contrary, should we demand that it find political solutions to the tragedy it is perpetuating?

268. The *apartheid* régime and certain of its allies have sometimes stated that all in all the situation in terms of economic statistics is better in South Africa than elsewhere on the continent. We would prefer to hear our South African brothers, freed from oppression and repression, proclaim this themselves.

269. The nub of the problem is that freedom and well-being cannot be reduced to a question of statistics or of stomachs to be filled. Otherwise it would be enough to eat and shut up. Let us simply take the time to note that, essentially, the evil laws of *apartheid* remain intact. We can cite a few at random: the Group Areas Act, the Population Registration Act, the Intimidation Act, the Internal Security Act, the Terrorism Act, the Labour Relations Act, of which everybody has heard, and another dozen, if not more.

270. What is more, the educational system in effect tends to put the blacks in a position of inferiority and to consolidate the division—starting from the physical criterion—of the whole of South African society, by placing the white race at the upper level and the black majority not at a lower level, which would be progress in itself, but totally outside the community, at the periphery of history.

271. In such a context of violence, one is not free to choose one's own course. The struggle against *apartheid* derives logically from that situation. The majority which supports the thesis of radical change supports that view.

272. It is salutary that the people of South Africa itself should subscribe to the view by remaining at the vanguard of the struggle by virtue of its national liberation movement. This people has already paid a heavy price in this struggle—Sharpeville in 1960 and Soweto in 1976 are its symbols.

273. The struggle continues. It is being carried on every day and at every opportunity as shown by the strike movements that have been sweeping the country since last year, not to mention the students' boycott of their studies to indicate their rejection of the system.

274. Every day the police and the army combine their actions, entering into peoples' homes and even mutilating and massacring children. Repression, arrests, humiliation and harassment of all sorts are daily facts of life in South Africa.

275. My country supports the armed struggle of the ANC because we understand its motives. However, as compared with the enemy, the South African people is fighting practically empty-handed. But the people will prevail because there are some struggles that cannot be lost, since right is on their side. In this case, victory follows the trend of history itself, whatever tricks may be used to delay its outcome.

276. One should not claim that recent contacts with certain friendly front-line countries modify the core of the problem. That would be proof of self-induced blindness. The willingness to negotiate, as was pointed out here on 27 September last by the Congolese Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation, Mr. Antoine Ndinga-Oba, is one of the components of the African position expressed since the Manifesto on Southern Africa, issued by the leaders of East and Central African States, meeting at Lusaka on 16 April 1969,[11]

277. In citing our President, Colonel Denis Sassou-Nguesso, the head of the Congolese delegation, stated during the general debate of the current session

> "The development of the revolutionary struggle on the spot is always complex, and the path to victory is tortuous." [*See 11th meeting, para. 49.*]

In this context current diplomatic activity

> "is naturally part of the process of a long and complex struggle which the peoples of southern Africa have been waging against the white minority régime . . . We are deeply convinced that Africa will not betray the African cause." [*Ibid.*]

278. In this multiform struggle, and the efforts of the United Nations on behalf of the people of southern Africa, my delegation wants to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and its Chairman, Mr. Joseph Garba of Nigeria, for the dynamism and constancy of their efforts.

279. Given what the Special Committee advocates in its excellent report, the delegation of the Congo welcomes the heightened awareness of international public opinion on behalf of the cause of the people of South Africa. We reiterate our position in support of sanctions and the isolation of the *apartheid* régime, in conformity with the pertinent provisions of the Charter, in particular those in Chapter VII.

280. South Africa deserves the imposition of such international sanctions because it does not conceal the short shrift it gives to the norms and principles of international law in maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia and persisting in South Africa itself in the ideology and practice of nazism—a doctrine which was responsible for the demise of the League of Nations and led to the Second World War and, by reaction, the creation of the United Nations in order that certain deeds never be repeated.

281. On 23 October last Bishop Desmond Tutu, the Nobel Prize laureate, declared before the Security Council that in South Africa there reigned "endemic unrest, like a festering sore that will not heal until not just the symptoms are treated but the root causes are removed."[9]

282. Is it possible that the South African Government is aware of this malaise even though it is ashamed of its Nobel Prize winner?

283. What, finally, should one think of the banishment of Nelson Mandela? Is it possible that, to live in that country, there is no alternative to exile or death? The liberation of Mandela should be one of the major battles for human rights by all those who are concerned about such rights.

284. In conclusion, aware as we are that man is the most precious of all creations in the world, we remain certain that his rehabilitation will be the task of all nations. For we are certain that, even from their graves, by the blood they have shed for freedom the martyrs of the South African people continue to struggle against *apartheid* and thereby to fertilize our conviction and our own commitment to that struggle.

285. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): May I first express to the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR our deepest condolences on the death of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of that country, Mr. Aleksei Fedoseevich Vatchenko. My people and Government wish to express their sorrow to the Government and the people of the Ukrainian SSR to whom we are linked by close ties of friendship and solidarity.

286. That the Government of South Africa is totally racist has been clearly reflected in the so-called constitutional reforms by which that Government tried, without success, to deceive the people of South Africa and the international community.

287. On 2 November 1983 that constitutional farce was endorsed by an electorate that was made up completely of whites. Three chambers segregated by race were set up to which the whites elected 178 members, the so-called Coloureds 85 members, and those of Asian origin 45 members.

288. This made it clear that, in the eyes of the Pretoria régime, there are four classes of citizen in South Africa and that their rights are correspondingly graded. In first place we have the whites, who, although numerically in the minority, have and can exercise all rights. The second place is occupied by the Coloureds and the third by the Indians and Asians. The fourth and last place is held by the blacks, who do not have or exercise any rights as South African citizens in spite of the fact that they are the majority and the indigenous population.

289. The exclusion of that majority of the population is disguised by the creation of so-called bantustans in which, supposedly, blacks can exercise their political rights and their rights as citizens. Whereas approximately 87.5 per cent of the territory of South Africa has been declared "white South Africa", the blacks, through a process of despoliation and expulsion, have been shunted into 10 bantustans—in other words, 12.7 per cent of the land has been allocated to 10 million blacks. Furthermore, the land allocated to the blacks is for the most part arid and subject to erosion.

290. In point of fact the blacks cannot exercise their rights, both because of their exclusion from all the political and legal systems of their nation and because, in the bantustans, it is poverty, deportation and economic domination that in fact govern the fate of the inhabitants.

291. Recently, in resolution 556 (1984), the Security Council demanded the dismantling of the bantustans and the cessation of uprooting, relocation and denationalization of the indigenous African people.

292. To ensure for itself complete control, the white minority also decided that each of the chambers should deal only with the affairs of each corresponding racial group and that Coloured and Asian members of Parliament should only have the right to put forward their cases in their own racial chambers on condition of having a certificate issued by the President to the effect that the item being proposed truly represent an affair proper to the corresponding population group. Likewise, the white minority has ensured that the Presidency of State will always be held by a white by setting up an electoral college composed of 50 white members, 25 so-called Coloured members and 13 Asians.

293. The so-called new constitution that entered into force on 3 September 1984 thus made quite clear the total lack of respect of the racist Pretoria Government for the decisions of the United Nations. A year or so ago this Assembly adopted resolution 38/11, which stated that what were at that time "constitutional proposals" were contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that the results of the referendum were of no validity whatsoever. Similarly, it warned that if the constitutional proposals were put into effect the conflict in South Africa and southern Africa would be exacerbated.

294. During 1984 the body with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council, adopted resolutions 554 (1984) and 556 (1984). The former resolution rejected, *inter alia*, and declared null and void the so-called "new constitution" and the August 1984 "elections", and urged Governments and organizations not to accord recognition to the results of the so-called "elections". The second resolution reiterated the Council's condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* and called for an immediate cessation of the killing and for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners and detainees.

295. Towards the end of September, at the current session, the General Assembly reiterated its rejection of the so-called "new constitution" and once again, in resolution 39/2, declared it null and void.

296. The States Members of the United Nations have had an opportunity to express their rejection of those measures, which are aimed at consolidating the racist and terrorist system of *apartheid*. None of those resolutions, however, has had the support of the United States, which thus demonstrates the falsity of its "lessons in democracy".

297. To date, we have heard no statement from Washington to the effect that the so-called constitutional reforms and elections in South Africa were a farce. Why is it that, if the United States feels it to be its responsibility to overthrow Governments around the world, it does not give its assistance to the black patriots of South Africa in their struggle against the heinous *apartheid* régime?

298. How can we explain the fact that for the United States there are no "freedom fighters" in the national liberation movements? With regard to the

conduct of the United States in relation to this problem, the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* states, *inter alia*:

> "The United States Government, in particular, has opposed and frustrated all international action to deal effectively with the acts of aggression by the Pretoria régime. It has welcomed and encouraged the manoeuvres of the Pretoria régime to entrench racism as positive changes.
>
> "While professing abhorrence of *apartheid*, it resists any action against the *apartheid* régime. While professing attachment to democracy, it attacks the main instruments of democratic transformation, the national liberation movements of the great majority of the people. It extols elements of the oppressive régime as forces for peaceful change and condones blackmail by the Pretoria régime against independent States as a peace process." [*A/39/22, paras. 330 and 333.*]

299. *Apartheid* as a form of exploitation and oppression must, in order to survive, resort to terror as its principal means of survival. That is the only way in which a minority can impose its will on the majority. The legal institutions, the armed forces and the police of South Africa all depend upon a régime of terror. In order to practice terrorism against the inhabitants of South Africa, the Pretoria Government has a whole series of laws that grant it license to intimidate, abduct and liquidate persons and organizations that refuse to accept this state of affairs. Under the national security laws the repressive forces of South Africa can disperse, attack, imprison and murder demonstrators. It is against this background that we must view the latest events in the streets of South Africa, where the Government of South Africa unleashed its violence against the South African people who, rightfully, were rebelling against their oppressors.

300. Turning to the outside, the terrorist régime of South Africa overruns its borders and attacks neighbouring countries and illegally occupies Namibia, for which the United Nations is directly responsible.

301. The attitude of total intransigence by the South African Government, its constant defiance of United Nations resolutions, its continued aggression against its neighbours and its apparently incorrigible racist policy are assisted by the protection that régime receives, mainly from the most powerful State in the Organization.

302. My delegation welcomes and shares the hopes expressed by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* that

> "Governments and peoples of the world, committed to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, will exert all their influence to persuade the Government of the United States of America, and others concerned, to desist from their present policies and co-operate in international action for the elimination of *apartheid*." [*Ibid., para. 339*].

303. The valiant struggle of the South African people, the heroes who have offered their lives to achieve the liberation of their country and those who day by day suffer the horrors of *apartheid*, demand that the United Nations devote itself with determination to the implementation of its resolutions and to overcoming the obstacles to the imposition of sanctions on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

304. The people of Nicaragua, which throughout its history has also been the victim of oppression and exploitation by hegemonistic interests, expresses its full solidarity with its South African brothers fighting against *apartheid*. We shall not cease to raise our voices in condemnation and repudiation of this heinous régime.

305. The PRESIDENT: As announced at an earlier plenary meeting, a number of draft resolutions will be submitted under this item, and some of them may have programme budget implications. The voting on those draft resolutions will therefore take place at a subsequent meeting.

306. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

307. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of Israel saw fit last Wednesday [*69th meeting*] to ignore the item "Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa" and, instead of finding a pretext for the close collaboration between zionism and racism in all fields, especially the military and nuclear, chose to speak of oil production, the importation of diamonds and gold, and foreign aid; and it used the traditional colonial argument to the effect that the close and direct contact between Israel and South Africa was the best way to achieve a change in South Africa's policy. What the representative of Israel said is not new. We have heard exactly the same thing from his predecessors, and it is not at all surprising. The Zionist movement is a racist movement—that is well known—based on the superiority of a certain race and a chosen people.

308. The first head of State to visit Israel after its foundation was the racist Smits from South Africa. He was warmly received by the leaders of zionism and said after his arrival: "Israel, like South Africa, is surrounded by Coloured enemies."

309. The representative of Israel also saw fit to attack the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and to speak about what he called "reports that to this very day in the interior of the Arabian peninsula slavery or something very much like it continues to exist". [*69th meeting, para. 87.*] The heart of the Arabian peninsula is open to everyone, and if there were any kind of slavery there, there would have been no need for false reports, which are only figments of the Israeli representative's imagination.

310. All that we want to say to the Israeli representative is that he should look to the state of slavery to which the Palestinian people are subjected in their homeland, the demolition of their homes, the closing of their schools and universities, the usurpation of their sacred places, waters and territories, and the racist repressive and oppressive acts practised by the Israeli entity against that defenceless people. After that, does he have the right to shed crocodile tears over the Africans against whom racial discrimination is practised?

311. As for the allegation of the Israeli representative that the Arab countries are not generous towards their African brothers, I should like to quote from a document of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983. It reads:

> "During the past 10 years, the total amount of financial assistance extended by Saudi Arabia through bilateral channels only was $US 35 billion. This aid was untied and took the form of either

pure grants or very concessional loans, with a grant element of at least 60 per cent on average. "More than 68 developing countries all over the world have benefited from the Kingdom's bilateral aid, 38 of whom are in Africa, 24 in Asia and 6 in other regions.

"On average, Saudi Arabia's development assistance amounted to $US 3.5 billion per annum during the said period. Of this $US 3.5 billion about 40 per cent were pure grants and the remainders were very soft loans.

"In addition, Saudi Arabia contributes to 12 regional development institutions which have a total capitalization of more than $US 15 billion with the Kingdom's share averaging 20 per cent of the total capital contributed. These institutions include the OPEC Fund for International Development to which the Kingdom's contribution is over 30 per cent of total resources, the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa, the International Fund for Agricultural Development to which the Kingdom is the second major contributor, the Islamic Development Bank, the Arab Monetary Fund, the African Development Fund and other institutions.

"The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has also been a major source of finance for the leading international financial institutions. During 1974–82 period, Saudi Arabia has supported the activities of the World Bank by providing $US 4 billion in loans. It has also provided nearly $US 16 billion to the International Monetary Fund."*

312. After hearing those facts no impartial person can accuse Saudi Arabia or the other Arab countries that contribute equally towards co-operation with the fraternal African countries of not being generous, in the way suggested by the sophistry of the Israeli representative.

313. It is not surprising that a Government that flouted all the norms and committed all kinds of crimes against the Palestinian and other Arab countries should distort the facts elsewhere, especially in the General Assembly, which has had sufficient evidence of the Israeli crimes.

314. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): Three speeches made in this debate require a brief comment in exercise of the right of reply.

315. The Soviet Union again seized upon the subject of *apartheid* to indulge in gratuitous, extended attacks on the United States. We find that odd, coming from a country ostensibly pledged to détente in an institution pledged to resolving disputes rather than exacerbating them. These attacks upon us seemed especially odd, since they came from the representative of a Power whose most notable contribution to Africa has been guns.

316. In the process, the representative of the Soviet Union alluded to the fact that we acknowledged that the United States and South Africa fought on the same side in the Second World War. That is true, and we have not forgotten that fact. Indeed, the Soviet Union and South Africa fought on the same side during the Second World War, although the Soviet Union's famous selective memory may have trouble recalling that fact. We even remember having fought on the same side as the Soviet Union in the Second World War, and the human rights record of that country before and since does not alter the fact of the enormous sacrifice its people made during that struggle.

317. The Syrian and Nicaraguan representatives also spoke about my Government's policies in the context of *apartheid* and South Africa. We are always happy to hear concern expressed about human rights. We can only hope that the concern expressed about human rights by those representatives will give rise to reflection on their part on how their Governments can contribute to greater enjoyment of human rights within their own borders.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

NOTES

[1] The delegations of El Salvador and Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[2] See E/CN.4/Sub.2/1984/8/Add.1.

[3] E/CN.4/Sub.2/425/Add.7.

[4] See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1984, Supplement No. 1*, resolution 1984/43.

[5] The delegation of El Salvador subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[6] The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on that part of paragraph 12 of the draft resolution.

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1981*, document S/14750, annex.

[8] See A/40/87, annex, para. 18.

[9] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year*, 2560th meeting.

[10] See A/38/451-S/16009, annex.

[11] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

72nd
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 26 November 1984,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. MADADHA (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to thank the Secretary-General, for his valuable reports to the Assembly. I should also like to thank the Chairman and the members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. I wish to thank, too, the Chairman and members of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories for their valuable and objective reports, which have informed us all of the facts of what is currently taking place in the occupied Arab territories and the efforts to bring back the lost peace in Palestine and the Middle East.

2. I wish to express my condolences to the Yugoslav delegation and Government on the death of Mr. Becir Meholjić, former representative of Yugoslavia in the Special Committee, which has saddened me very much.

3. The Secretary-General, in his report on the work of the Organization, says:

> "After the Second World War there was admittedly a certain over-confidence in the capacity of international institutions, born of a desperate desire to build a new and better world. It then seemed possible to establish, as a first priority, a system for maintaining international peace and security under the provisions of the Charter. If such a system could become effective, the main obstacle to disarmament and arms limitation, the insecurity of nations, would be removed, and the rule of law rather than the rule of force would at last begin to come into its own on the international level." [*See A/39/1.*]

The Secretary-General also states that: "There is also, on occasion, an apparent reluctance to make the effort required to use international organizations effectively." [*Ibid.*]

4. Two principles have become enshrined in international relations: the principles of the non-use of force in solving international disputes and the necessity of creating an international institution to establish the laws, organize them and ensure their effective use and implementation in human relations. These principles were established by mankind after the suffering in many wars, which led to the death or dispersal of millions of people. Therefore, the League of Nations was set up, followed by the United Nations.

5. The principle of the non-use of force for the settlement of international disputes became one of the most important principles of the United Nations. Beginning in 1948, the year in which Israel was created, and continuing to this day—that is, for 36 years—the Organization has been attempting to ensure implementation of a resolution adopted in 1947 [*resolution 181 (II)*] which called for the creation of two States on the land of Palestine, one for Israel and the other for Palestine. Throughout all that time, Israel has derided and flouted the United Nations, which created it in the first place, and has disregarded the Organization's resolutions and decisions.

6. The first principle on which the United Nations was based, the principle of the non-use of force in solving international disputes, became the first principle, but in reverse, of the Israeli State created by the Organization; resort to force became Israel's main method of settling its disagreements with the neighbouring Arab States. The international Organization which established Israel became, according to Israel—and has been so declared by Israel's leaders and presidents—merely a group of poor and weak developing countries which have fallen under the influence of Arab money and blackmail. Right, in its opinion, has become something that can be bought with money and weapons, not decided by the rule of law and legitimacy. There are dozens of examples of what has been said and written by Israeli leaders and representatives concerning their opinion of the countries of Asia and Africa.

7. The most important principle in the Charter of the United Nations, that pertaining to the non-use of force, became the most important principle in Israeli practices but in a thoroughly distorted way. Israel's security, in its opinion, can be achieved only by force. Peace can be achieved only by force. It was witchcraft, therefore, turned against the witch; the innocent lamb which saddened the world because of its suffering at the hands of the Nazis and the Fascists during the Second World War turned into a ferocious wolf which eats everything in its way; force became the basis of everything and the Arabs were unable to understand anything else. That is the Israeli logic, and it has tried to convince the world of this logic. Whoever understands such logic becomes the wise man who sympathizes with Semitism; whoever does not accept such a principle and believes in something else becomes an anti-Semite who is subjected to Arab blackmail and money. Nazi sadism applied to Jews became Israeli sadism applied to Arabs. The Nazi ovens built for Jews have been turned by the Israelis into ovens for the Palestinians. In this respect, I

would recommend to anyone who wishes to know more about the sadistic Israeli theories the works of Ben-Gurion, Moshe Dayan and Menachem Begin describing the massacres by the Israelis in Deir Yassin, Qibya and Nahalin and elsewhere. When the Haganah and Stern terrorists killed and bombed, these activities were considered by the Israelis to be legitimate Semitic actions to eradicate the Palestinian people because it is an uncivilized people which does not deserve to live, but when a Palestinian takes action against those who have usurped his land and turned him into a homeless refugee, he becomes, in the eyes of Israel, a terrorist who must be punished by the international community.

8. With regard to terrorism, history shows that the first to use political terrorism in the region was Israel and its organizations—beginning with the assassination of British soldiers and officers during the days of the Mandate and acts of sabotage, such as the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem on 22 July 1946, the assassination of the United Nations Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte on 17 September 1948 and dozens of terrorist activities that had been unprecedented in our region, such as the booby-trapped parcels that were mailed to foreign experts working in Egypt.

9. There is not enough time now to list the innumerable massacres, assassinations and other crimes perpetrated by Israel in the Palestinian refugee camps and against civilians in Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. The worst and most heinous was the massacre two years ago in Beirut of the inhabitants of the Sabra and Shatila camps.

10. All those crimes, including massacres and other acts of terrorism, were carried out to protect Israel's security, according to the unusual Israeli logic, the logic that Israel presents to the world community to justify its aggression. Israel occupies the lands of others and kills, pillages and perpetrates massacres to protect its security and borders. Then it refuses to withdraw from the occupied territories, using the same arguments and rather strange logic in defining security. We still ask, as we have always asked: who needs security—the aggressor or the victim of aggression?

11. In response to Israel's policy of intransigence, hegemony and force, as well as its false idea of security, there are two schools of political thought in the Arab world. The first, which my country embraces, believes that hope of a political solution to our disputes with Israel has not been completely lost. We believe that there is still a chance to avoid war and the evils of war in our region and the world. That is why we have always sought peace through a comprehensive international solution acceptable to all parties.

12. There is another group that has ceased seeking peace with Israel. This group has become convinced that Israel, which was established by force, can only understand the logic of force. We still say to our brothers who have become exhausted by Israel's intransigence and continued aggression: "Remain patient, as we do. There is still some justice in the world." We have always said, and we continue to say to our friends and all peace-loving States, as we say in the United Nations: "Help us to stop Israeli aggression. Help us to change the Israeli logic of force and its mistaken understanding of security. Help us to attain peace so as not to lose the hope of convincing those who have lost all hope of peace that it is not truly lost."

13. When Israel was created, it originally deluded the Jewish people into thinking that it had reached the end of its suffering and its historic plight, that now that it had returned to its homeland it would live in peace and harmony. It told that people that it was not to be afraid of the Palestinians and the other Arabs who lived in Palestine because Israel would chase them away, massacre them and terrorize them; it would be a matter of a few years and then the Palestinians would be reduced to silence and the Jews might begin to live in opulence.

14. What happened after that? The Palestinians did not forget their land and soil; they resisted, wanting to return to their homeland. Instead of enjoying a peaceful life in Palestine, the illusory life offered by the Israeli leaders, the Jews have lived in terror because of the Arab resistance. They live in a perpetual armed state. Since 1948, the Jewish people have known four wars, in which thousands of Jewish youth have fallen, but that people will continue to fight as long as its Government continues to follow a policy of imposing security and peace by force. That is why we say that if Israel wants real peace and security for its people, if it wants that people to live in brotherhood and harmony with the Muslims and Christians in Palestine, it must understand that peace cannot be attained by force. That is the logic of history, and it will remain so.

15. The deteriorating conditions of Palestinian Arabs under Israeli rule provide no hope regarding Israel's will for peace, especially in the light of the Israeli policy of which I have just spoken—the use of force in its relations with the Arabs and Palestinians.

16. In his letter of transmittal of the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, the Chairman wrote:

> "The information contained in this report reflects the continuation of the policy of annexation and settlement which the Government of Israel has followed with increasing vigour in the territories occupied in June 1967. Settlements that were established in earlier years have been enlarged and consolidated, new settlements have been established and plans for further settlements have been announced extending into the next century. The number of Israeli settlers continues to increase . . . " [*A/39/591, p. 5*].

17. Since the report, which lists hundreds of continuing Israeli violations of the most fundamental human rights in the occupied territories, is before the Assembly, I will not go into its details, but I should like to draw attention to the following passage in the letter of transmittal:

> "The Special Committee cannot but reiterate its hope that this report may serve as the base upon which the international community can assess the plight of the civilian population and the urgent need to improve their condition. Without meaningful and effective action in this respect the international community is allowing itself to get nearer to a situation in the region which it will find eventually very difficult to resolve." [*Ibid., p. 6.*]

18. In a letter to the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People writes:

> "The volume of evidence accumulated in the above-mentioned documents clearly indicates that the rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories are being flagrantly violated and that its situation has continued to worsen" [*A/39/403, p. 2*].

19. The report of that Committee says that its Chairman sent a number of letters to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council concerning Israel's violations of Palestinian rights, adding:

> "Those communications, for the most part, dealt with practices and policies of the Israeli Government which, in the opinion of the Committee, were not only in direct contravention of international law and of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949, but were also contrary to the spirit of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the subject and contradictory to the recommendations of the Committee itself.
>
> "The communications thus expressed concern over the continuing Israeli occupation of the Palestinian and Arab territories and its policies of establishing illegal Jewish settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories, the confiscation of Arab-owned land and widespread and frequent violation by Israel of the rights of the Palestinian people. The communications also draw attention to reported plans of the Israeli Government to apply its legislation to the occupied territories. They also expressed the constant concern of the Committee over Israeli actions affecting the lives and well-being of Palestinians living as refugees in Lebanon." [*A/39/35, paras. 20 and 21.*]

20. While Israel sheds crocodile tears over the lost peace, while it heaps blame on the Arabs for refusing peace, it at the same time practises against the inhabitants of the occupied territories the harshest kind of repression known to mankind. The documents before the Assembly clearly show the policies of annexation, settlement and Judaization resorted to by Israel with one clear aim: to empty the occupied territories of their original inhabitants so as to attract immigrants from overseas and create more settlements. The report presented to the Assembly continues:

> "The net result is that the economic policies of the occupying Power have created a situation of total dependence of the economies of the West Bank and Gaza, by controlling their production and reducing their capacity to create employment in such a manner as to diminish their potential for independent economic development." [*Ibid., para. 35.*]

21. The same report shows that Israel, up to the end of May of this year, 1984, had confiscated approximately half the area in the West Bank and that one quarter of those confiscated territories have been set aside for establishing illegal settlements. It states that:

> "Estimates based on Israeli and Palestinian data indicate that, by now, almost all of the Jordan Valley's potentially cultivable land has been expropriated for new Israeli settlements." [*Ibid., para. 24.*]

Elsewhere in the same report the Committee states:

> "There is at the same time an overall annual decline in residential construction in towns and villages of the occupied territories . . . For many years, no low-income housing has been publicly subsidized. In addition, punitive demolition of houses continues at an accelerated rate . . . " [*ibid., para. 27*].

22. These reports, written by international organizations and committees, point out the reality of Israel's colonization of the occupied Arab territories and its continued violation of human rights. In the field of agriculture, land is continually being confiscated and water courses diverted and confiscated. Israeli markets are being closed to Palestinian exports, while occupied Arab markets are being flooded with Israeli goods. As a result, the Arab landowner becomes a tenant farmer, dependent on Israeli farms to ensure his and his family's livelihood. In industry, there is nearly total stagnation because of lack of capital and the fact that the Israelis obstruct the arrival of investment capital by imposing taxes and high tariffs and by closing Israeli markets to Arab exports. In the field of tourism, foreign visitors are systematically diverted from Arab historical and tourist sites to Israeli sites. In the field of commerce, financial institutions are closed by force and high taxes are imposed on them. Unemployment is increasing and students are forced to accept any job.

23. The report of the Director-General of the International Labour Office on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories states:

> "An examination of developments since the last report of the Director-General suggests that . . . there is growing cause for concern over the situation of Arab workers in the occupied territories . . . " [*A/39/403, annex I, para. 68*].

The report also states that "it is estimated that some 85 per cent of the East Jerusalem population do not have even the minimum needed to live without outside help" [*ibid., para. 41*].

24. And that is not all. Universities are arbitrarily closed and students and lecturers continually harassed. University properties are pillaged and places of worship attacked. Municipalities are dissolved and elected mayors expelled. Inhabitants are arbitrarily detained and any Arab assistance to them prevented. The rights of unions are violated, their headquarters closed and their documents confiscated. Workers are discharged without compensation. All this is in addition to the conditions described in the two reports presented by WHO and UNESCO [*ibid., annexes II and III*], which show the very bad health and educational situation of the inhabitants in the occupied territories.

25. What are the conclusions reached by all these reports based on data provided by international organizations and committees whose documents are above suspicion? They arrive at three basic conclusions: first, that there are two perfectly separate societies in the occupied Arab territories: the ruling colonial Israeli society and the Arab and Palestinian society, which suffers the worst kinds of humiliation and slavery at the hands of their colonizers; secondly, that Israel continues to practise its policies of force and terrorism against the Arab inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories; and thirdly, that Israel's claims that it wishes peace with its Arab neighbours are devoid of credibility and sincerity in the light of these rather bitter facts.

26. After five Arab-Israeli wars, after much bloodshed and destruction, and ensuing home-

lessness on both sides, we come back once again to the question already put by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan before the General Assembly in the general debate at the current session [*14th meeting*]: What now? We believe that those wars taught us realities and basic lessons on which all of us, and in particular Israel, must reflect, so that we can find a path leading to a comprehensive and durable peace in this tortured area. The first of these lessons is that the Palestinian and Arab peoples are not belligerent warmongers, as Israel tries to portray them. They are like all other people in the world. They want to live in peace, without war and destruction. Israel must, in particular, become aware of this fact and must give them as well as its own people the opportunity of achieving this objective. The second lesson is that force is not a solution to international problems. Force cannot lead to peace and security. Occupation of the lands of others by force cannot provide security. As long as there is occupation there will always be resort to force and violence on both sides. The existence of such occupation, under any slogan used to justify it, be it "self-rule" or another name, will continue to be faced by rebellion, mistrust and ill intentions on both sides and in turn will lead to force and violence. The third lesson that we must accept, and particularly Israel, is that genuine peace is one that creates good intentions and trust between the two warring parties and that any treaties or agreements arrived at through force cannot produce good intentions and mutual trust, which are the real bases for any international or bilateral peace process. The fourth reality is that security guarantees must either be international or have international blessing so that their success and effectiveness can be assured. The United Nations has succeeded every time it has been entrusted with maintaining security based on trust and mutual goodwill. The important fifth factor which has been proved true and is clear to all is that the two super-Powers have interests and concerns in the Middle East, whether strategic or economic, and this means—because, if the peace process is to be realistic we cannot hide our heads in the sand like ostriches—that a comprehensive, not a unilateral, solution is required. Unilateral solutions that do not take into account the interests and concerns of other parties cannot succeed, because those other parties, in defence of their interests, will exert every possible effort to thwart such unilateral attempts and again we shall return to the vicious circle that we have mentioned of lack of trust, bad faith and resort to force. There would be opposition to that force and thus the avalanche of violence and instability would be set off again.

27. In his report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General says:

> "The strongest peace-keeping operation would be one which had the unreserved support, political, diplomatic and financial, of *all* the Members of the United Nations and even the actual participation of the permanent members of the Security Council under the mandate of the Council. This may be unrealistic at present, but it is also the political truth which indeed applies across the whole range of the activities of the Organization." [*See A/39/1.*]

28. The sixth lesson which we must draw is one that we hope every Jew living inside Israel will be made aware of—every Jew who desires for his family, his children and his grandchildren a life of peace, without threats, violence, mutual killing—that it is impossible to think that 4 million Palestinians can be eradicated. This lesson must be learned if the Jewish people want to live with Muslims and Christians in Palestine and in an Arab society of approximately 200 million, if Israel wants to live in peace and security. We must remember that Israel and the occupied Palestinian territories are rich in natural resources and are large enough for several times the present number of inhabitants. The Palestinians and Arabs have accepted the idea of two neighbouring States, in Israel and the occupied Palestinian territories; Israel must therefore accept the territory allocated to it by this international Organization. It must give up the policy of greed, which in the long run will achieve nothing.

29. The seventh reality that we hope Israel will become aware of—and the world is convinced of this—is that no peace process can succeed without the participation of representatives of the Palestinian people. In the first place, the aggression has been against Palestine, not the Arab States, and the basic disagreement is an Israeli-Palestinian one. Therefore, there can be no peace without the presence of Palestinian representatives at the negotiating table. Since there is international unanimity between Arabs and Palestinians that the only representative of the Palestinian people is the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*], Israel must heed the international will; it must recognize the PLO—and vice versa—and it must drop the claim, which has been rejected throughout the world, that the PLO is a terrorist organization and the demand that it delete from its charter the idea of driving Israel into the sea. Of what use would it be for the PLO to say that it was no longer a threat to Israel and to delete that phrase from its charter if that were done without good intentions and simply to embarrass Israel and force it to negotiate? We have already said that the basic precondition of real peace is the existence of good faith and mutual trust under international guarantees.

30. The last point that I wish to mention concerns an erroneous theory based on the false idea of peace to which I have already referred. According to this erroneous theory, Israel must be militarily superior if peace is to be achieved. But what peace could there be in the region achieved through super-armament? Those who advocate that theory say that as long as there was Israeli superiority Israel would feel more secure and that would increase its desire for peace, and that, as Arabs saw that Israeli superiority, they would feel the need for peace. Facts and events have proved how wrong that theory is. Indeed, the contrary is true, because while Israel increases its armaments it feels stronger, more intransigent and more hegemonistic; it does not feel any need for peace. It knows that it is superior, that it can attack others and that it can depend on an endless flow of weapons and money? On the other hand, with increasing Israeli armaments the Arabs feel a need for weapons—weapons which have become very easy to obtain—so as to protect themselves against Israeli aggression. And thus, again, we start that vicious circle of armaments at the expense of the poor people who are being killed, spending large sums of money for that purpose while development activities cease.

31. The Secretary-General, in his report, states that: "In the light of the deep tension in the Middle East and the emergence of new factors in the situation, nothing could be less realistic than to expect the

indefinite continuation of the present situation of no peace—no war" [*A/39/600, para. 49*].

32. Many peace proposals for the region have been presented since the adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), including President Reagan's plan, of 1 September 1982;[1] the Arab peace plan embodied in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez;[2] the declaration issued at Venice on 13 June 1980 by the European Council;[3] the Soviet proposal, made on 15 September 1982;[4] and the Egyptian-French proposal submitted to the Security Council as a draft resolution on 28 July 1982.[5] Israel has refused all those proposals, and thus we come back to the question of what Israel wants. Those peace plans all have one common denominator—the need for Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories and for security guarantees for all the parties in the region. There is a second fundamental question: if the world is unanimous on the matter of Israeli withdrawal, why has withdrawal not yet taken place?

33. Before concluding, I should like to quote from two important reports before us which give some facts about the painful realities in our countries while the international community continues its tortuous search for peace in the Middle East and Palestine. The Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People states the following:

> "The Committee feels that, at this critical juncture, a concentrated effort to find a just solution to the question of Palestine and to end the unacceptable plight of the Palestinian people is long overdue.
>
> "The Committee is convinced that the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, recommended by the Geneva Conference and endorsed in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, will provide an opportunity for all parties concerned to participate in negotiations which should lead to a just solution of the problem. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommends that international action should henceforth concentrate on the preparations necessary for the convening of this Conference and contribute to its successful and peaceful outcome." [*A/39/35, paras. 159 and 160.*]

34. The Secretary-General also says in his report:

> "It seems obvious that the Middle East conflict, involving as it does complex interrelated issues, can ultimately be fully resolved only by a comprehensive settlement covering all its aspects. This fact needs to be kept firmly in mind by the parties concerned, since all the agreements that have been reached in the past, whether within the United Nations framework or outside it, were clearly intended as interim steps in the search for a comprehensive peace. I continue to believe that a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East will have to meet the following conditions: the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from occupied territories; respect of and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force; and, lastly, a just settlement of the Palestinian problem based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including self-determination. In this context, the question of Jerusalem also remains of primary importance." [*A/39/600, para. 38.*]

35. In the same report, the Secretary-General provides some ideas which could be of help in finding a framework for a comprehensive and durable peace in Palestine and the Middle East. He says:

> "Earlier this year, both in the Middle East and elsewhere, I discussed with a number of Governments concerned the possibility of using the machinery of the Security Council in a new way to work with the parties concerned on various aspects of the Middle East problem and to distil from the various proposals and plans that have been put forward in recent years the common elements that could help to work out the basis of a negotiating structure. I believed that such a process, if it could be initiated, might still have served to clear the ground and to prepare for a full-fledged effort to negotiate the problem." [*Ibid., para. 45.*]

36. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The item under consideration today, entitled "The situation in the Middle East", should in fact be entitled "The question of Palestine", because it is the result of the first Israeli aggression that has now expanded to encompass the whole of the Middle East. We debate this item, we submit texts and ideas, we engage in rhetoric, we acquaint ourselves with the reports of the Secretary-General on the Middle East, and we note that everything proceeds from the question of Palestine. We listen to statements on the question of the Middle East, we adopt resolutions one after another, and still we find ourselves examining the Palestinian question; that is why what we today call "The situation in the Middle East" reconfirms that the Palestinian question is the essence and the core of the problem of the Middle East. Any attempt to resolve the crisis without dealing with its central element, namely, Palestine, or to resolve it at the expense of that central element, would be an insidious and misleading attempt, leading us nowhere. It is impossible to resolve the problem of the Middle East without facing the core of the matter and without resolving the question of the Palestinian people in such a way as to restore to it all of its usurped rights. The Arab rejection of the Camp David agreements is evidence of Arab determination to preserve their inalienable rights.

37. Any constructive discussion of any aspect of this problem that is threatening international peace and security must go back to the very roots of the question which the General Assembly is considering. The roots of the Middle East crisis—which has given rise to the Arab-Israeli conflict—go back to the beginning of the century, to the conflict of interests of the colonialist Powers and their frenzied race in which they tried to divide the region of the Middle East and parcel out among themselves territories having great strategic importance and immense natural resources, as well as shipping lanes and air and land routes, of vital interest to the whole world. These colonialist designs completely overlooked the interests of the peoples of the region and even trampled underfoot the most sacred right of all, namely, the right of peoples to self-determination.

38. Thus the conflict was born when Palestine was partitioned, not to make out of it a homeland for its

people but a geographical sphere in which to test methods of applying a new and different type of colonialism, one with settlers of diverse nationalities, built on a racist doctrine and having destructive aims. The interests of the European Zionist movement converged with the interests of the colonialist countries, and thus was concluded "the great sale" sanctified by the Balfour promise of 1917 which provided for the establishment of a homeland for Jews in Palestine. To reciprocate, the Zionist movement—which is an outcrop of European colonialist societies—has undertaken to safeguard Western colonialist interests in this region by, above all, controlling the Suez Canal and rupturing the geographical continuity between the Arab East and the Arab West, the Mashreg and the Maghreb, thereby destroying the aspirations of the Arab people for unity, liberty and progress.

39. Accordingly, it is not possible for the General Assembly to discuss the Middle East crisis by proceeding from the most recent act of Israeli aggression against an Arab people, but must take an overall view and discuss the crisis since the first aggression. If we were not to do this we would be falling into the trap laid by Israel, by accepting the most recent of the *faits accomplis* established by Israel through its successive wars, the aim of which is to make the international community forget the results of the previous wars and centre its attention on the effects of the most recent one, its consequences, and so on.

40. It would be naive to believe Israel when it claims to have occupied southern Lebanon in 1982 in order to ensure what it calls "the security of Galilee". The occupation by Israel of part of southern Lebanon is the implementation of a plan elaborated in 1919 by the Jewish Agency and submitted to the Peace Conference in Paris. The occupation by Israel in 1967 of Palestinian and Syrian territories was part of that plan. The occupation of the territory of the Palestinian State, in conformity with the unjust partition resolution of 1947 [*resolution 181 (II)*], was not merely the beginning of expansion, but a stage in the absorption of Palestine as a whole by preventing the establishment of a Palestinian State in accordance with that resolution.

41. The General Assembly is now confronted with the continuing Israeli occupation of the whole of Palestine, the Golan and southern Lebanon and with the intransigence of Israel, which refuses to cancel its annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan and to withdraw forthwith and unconditionally from southern Lebanon, in accordance with Security Council resolution 509 (1982). Israel continues the expropriation of the Arab lands occupied since 1967 and the Judaization of them by establishing settlements and creating the necessary conditions to clear the West Bank of its Arab population, in conformity with its racist ideology based on the slogan "A land without people for a people without land". This idea is based on a false hypothesis transformed by the Israelis into a policy which it continues to apply daily in order to give retroactive effect to the idea. In an official statement, Yitzhak Shamir, the head of the Stern Gang—the assassin of the United Nations Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte—confirmed this principle when he said: "Israel has not taken these territories from their legitimate owners by invasion; it has liberated them from the countries that invaded them in 1948." He added: "We have not annexed them and we shall never annex them, for they are part of the land of Israel and you do not annex land which is part of your country."

42. Shamir in fact was expressing established Zionist thinking on the alleged right of Israel to expropriate, in the name of zionism and Judaism, all the land between the Nile and the Euphrates, as if there were no Arab presence and no Arab rights there. Perhaps the best description of the nature and the role of Israel was given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, in his capacity as President of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983. He said:

> "Now, for the fifth time since its establishment in 1948, Israel is again at war with the Arab and Palestinian peoples. Although the pretexts for murder, aggression and invasion may change with time, the logic behind them remains the same: that of Zionist policy, whose final objective is to reduce the Palestinian people to obedience and to create what David Ben-Gurion called "the third kingdom of David", a "greater Israel" extending from the Nile to the Euphrates."[6]

43. As for those who have the right to inhabit Greater Israel, Zionism defined these by imposing Israeli sovereignty on Jews throughout the world, wherever they may be, and by binding them to the "Promised Land". The Zionist leaders, both lay and religious, have established the theory that whosoever is born of a Jewish mother, wherever in the world it may be, is an Israeli.

44. The American Professor Noam Chomsky, in his book *The Fateful Triangle*,[7] in the context of a comparison he was making between the two Israeli parties, the Labour Party and the Likud, said that the two parties refused to recognize any Palestinian national right west of the Jordan. He added that: "The state of Israel, as the courts have determined, is not the state of its citizens. Rather, it is 'the sovereign state of the Jewish people', where the Jewish people consist not only of the people residing in Israel but also of the Jews in Diaspora."* He ends by stating: "Thus, there is no Israeli nation apart from the Jewish people in this sense."* That is what is being claimed by the judiciary in Israel. As for the legislative power, it has decided, according to Chomsky, "that the historic right of the Jewish people to the land of Israel, including the West Bank, is beyond challenge."*

45. Golda Meir summarized in one sentence the expansionist purpose of the laws when she claimed, incorrectly, that: "It was not as though there was a Palestinian people in Palestine considering itself as a Palestinian people and we came and threw them out and took their country away from them. They did not exist."*

46. If we add to all of this the "law of return", which flagrantly violates both international law and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we can see that Israel is working systematically to annihilate the Palestinians in order to establish Greater Israel by bringing in Jewish settlers from all over the world. This has spread to the Golan Heights and to all the regions occupied by the Israeli army—the fifth most powerful army in the world, the Israelis claim.

47. In short, Israel is an expansionist entity which is gradually implementing its policy in Arab territory in order to create Greater Israel and gather there all the 20 million Jews in the world, whether they like it or

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

not, by attracting or intimidating them in the name of religion, race or history. Israel considers anybody who does not agree with this policy like a traitor to his religion because he does not participate in the crimes of State colonialism. One of the most recent victims of the Zionist dictatorship, the American Jewish writer Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht, described the Zionist dictatorship in her book *The Fate of the Jews.*[8] She said: "In November 1982, three rabbis held a rabbinical court at a Holiday Inn in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, and excommunicated all the members of the Agenda, plus a number of important Jews, including several rabbis, because they had signed an ad criticizing Israel's invasion of Lebanon."* By way of example, I quote the celebrated American writer I. F. Stone, who opposed this treatment and said: "Any Jew who says a nice word about Arabs or peace is supposed to be having an identity crisis or be self-hating."*

48. It is paradoxical that the vast majority of Jews in the United States are advocating the separation of Church and State in their own country, whereas they advocate the contrary in Israel, while calling for the use of American taxpayers' money to protect what they call "the State of Israel", which they believe to be the incarnation of the Jewish-Christian heritage. They forget that Christianity has spread throughout all the countries included in Israeli expansionist designs in our region. They make no distinctions between Arabs, because Zionist animosity towards Christian Arabs is no less than their animosity towards Muslim Arabs. They forget, too, that Palestine is the cradle of Christianity and that the oldest church in the world is to be found in our region.

49. It is undeniable that the Zionist information service in the United States, thanks to the Zionist lobby at the United States Congress, has succeeded in persuading the public that Israel is an islet of democracy in the region and has only one goal—namely, peace with the Arabs who surround it on all sides—and that it is the Arabs who have rejected such peace.

50. It is not necessary to remind the General Assembly that Israel has thwarted all peace efforts and rejected the Arab peace proposals made at Fez.[2] It has even rejected the idea of the holding of an international conference on peace in the Middle East. It has barred the way to any efforts to establish a just peace, based on international legitimacy and United Nations resolutions, under the auspices and within the framework of the Organization. We refer the Assembly to the letter dated 26 April 1984 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General [*A/39/214*], which is but one small example of Israeli refusals. Israel has not only refused to participate in the conference but stated in that letter that the peace conference proposed in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C is a "hollow propaganda exercise" devoid of any meaning, and an attempt on the part of the General Assembly "to undermine Security Council resolution 242 (1967)", which, as everyone knows, denied the existence of the Palestinian question and all the rights of the Palestinians.

51. My Government has given its full support to the holding of this conference and has stated:

> "Based on that position of principle the Syrian Arab Republic has spared no effort in urging the necessity of establishing a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question within the framework of the United Nations and on the basis of United Nations resolutions concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict and the question of Palestine." [*A/39/416.*]

52. It is on this basis that the Syrian Arab Republic agreed to Security Council resolution 338 (1973), affirming that the Syrian Government's understanding of the resolution is based on two essential elements, namely:

> "(*a*) The complete withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories which were occupied in June 1967 and subsequently;
>
> "(*b*) The safeguarding of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations."[9]

53. The Syrian Government also stated:

> "In accordance with these convictions, which reflect the wishes of the international community, the Syrian Arab Republic supported General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, dated 13 December 1983, calling for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, on an equal footing with other parties in order to attain a just and comprehensive settlement of the question of the Middle East that would guarantee that Israel evacuated all the Arab territories occupied since 1967 and ensure the realization of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish its own independent State in its national territory." [*Ibid.*]

54. Moreover, the Syrian Arab Republic approved and welcomed the Soviet peace plan.[4]

55. Whence has Israel drawn and still draws its capacity for continual defiance of the United Nations? We can find an answer to this in a similar refusal illustrating the position of the United States and stated in a letter dated 13 January 1984 from its representative, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, to the President of the Security Council [*A/39/130, Appendix*]. This double rejection of the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East was mentioned in the report of the Secretary-General: "At present, however, it is clear from the replies of the Governments of Israel . . . and the United States of America . . . that they are not prepared to participate in the proposed conference." [*A/39/130/Add.1, para. 4.*]

56. The General Assembly has no other course than to condemn the United States and Israel for this refusal, which is contrary to the very bases of peace and the principles agreed to by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983. This refusal by Israel confirms the validity of the statement of the General Assembly in a resolution adopted on 5 February 1982 at the ninth emergency special session, and since confirmed at all regular sessions, that:

> "Israel's record and actions confirm that it is not a peace-loving Member State and that it has carried out neither its obligations under the Charter nor its commitment under General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949" [*resolution ES-9/1, para. 11*].

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

57. Israeli settlement practices in the occupied Arab territories, in spite of assassinations and terrorism both official and unofficial, and in spite of acts of deportation and detention, derive from the Zionist philosophy which has taken the form of the imposition of a *fait accompli* through which Israel believes that it can annex the West Bank, including Jerusalem, Gaza and the Golan. But Israel is wrong, because the Arabs have the will and the means to erase that *fait accompli* which runs against their national rights. History does not belong to Israel. We are convinced that our Arab nation is capable of changing the direction assumed by Israel. The struggle for the liberation of our soil and for the restoration of the rights of the Palestinians goes on, and that persistence of the Arab-Israeli conflict shows that the Arab nation refuses to bend to the will of Israel which is threatening our peoples as a whole and all the countries of the Middle East region, without exception.

58. The information contained in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories indicates that Israel has established, since 1967, 160 settlements in the West Bank, 19 in Gaza and 41 in the Syrian territory of Golan and has taken over 40 per cent of the land in the West Bank so that it might be exploited by the Israelis. The same report indicates that, David Levy, who was the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Housing said on 9 January 1984: "in the past year alone there was a 45 per cent growth in the Jewish population of the territories—from 20,000 to 29,000" [*A/39/591, para. 254*]. The report also notes that the Ministerial Committee on Settlement decided, on 10 June 1984, to establish two new settlements in the Golan, at Ein Kanaf and Daliot and that the head of the Jewish Agency's settlement department, Mattityahu Drobles, said that "there would be more than 100,000 Jews in the area [the West Bank and the Golan] by 1985" [*ibid., para. 246*].

59. The report states further:

> "On the basis of the information and evidence before it, the Special Committee notes that the general policy of the Government of Israel continues to follow the same lines as in previous years. This policy is based on the concept that the territories occupied by Israel in 1967 constitute part of the State of Israel and that, therefore, measures taken by the Government of Israel, such as the establishment of settlements and the transfer of Israeli citizens to the occupied territories did not constitute a process of annexation. Illustrative of this policy are statements by members of the Government of Israel made during the period covered by this report and reflected in section IV.B above. The Special Committee notes that statements of this kind, however formulated, reflecting an unequivocal intention of the Government of Israel to annex the territories occupied by it in 1967 are in violation of the obligations of Israel under the Fourth Geneva Convention." [*Ibid., para. 328.*]

60. It is clear from the Committee's report that Israel is also preparing to occupy Jordan. It cites a statement by Ariel Sharon, responsible for the genocide at Sabra and Shatila in Beirut in 1982 and the genocide at Qibya in 1953, that "even if Israel did not currently claim those parts of Eretz Yisrael which comprised Jordan, 'we should always recall that, though they are not in our hands, they are ours'" [*ibid., para. 246*]. All these statements confirm that Israeli policy is a chain of annexation, including the annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan.

61. It is well known that the transfer of population into the occupied territories and out of them is a grave violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[10] These grave violations are nothing but war crimes for which the culprits must be held responsible and brought to account one day by international justice. The Nuremberg Tribunal and all that flowed from it remind us of the need for this. Ariel Sharon, who has brought a suit against *Time* magazine because it told the truth about his direct involvement in the massacres of Sabra and Shatila, should be paying for those crimes himself instead of demanding damages of $50 million.

62. Notwithstanding the flagrant violations of the fourth Geneva Convention, the United States Government has so far refused to regard the settlements as illegal, thereby encouraging Israel to press ahead with its policy of annexation openly and rampantly thanks to American financial support. Even so, United States leaders have been saying hypocritically that they are linked to the Arabs by bonds of friendship stemming from their interests in the region—as if the Arab people were obliged to accept United States hegemony, hidden beneath the veil of friendship for the Arabs, along with Israeli aggression.

63. In southern Lebanon, Israeli sadism is manifesting itself in the most horrendous forms. In the territory occupied by Israeli forces since 6 June 1982, killings and assassinations, kidnappings, torture and imprisonment have become everyday occurrences. The Israeli army has been increasingly ingenious in its acts of sabotage, terrorism, looting and theft of water resources. Israel has destroyed agricultural infrastructures in order to impose Israeli produce on the population, uprooting orchards to prevent the marketing of Lebanese produce and to spread famine and poverty among the local population. The destruction of the economic, social and cultural infrastructures is both a means and an end, the end being to empty the region of its Lebanese inhabitants and prevent the return of those who leave, by applying the Israeli expansionist idea, based on the slogan "A land without a people for a people without land". As for the means, as we have said, it is being done through sheer terrorism.

64. The Lebanese are now well aware that Israeli practices are directed against their very existence as a people and as a nation. The representative of Lebanon, in a letter to the Secretary-General, dated 29 May 1984 [*A/39/282*], described Israel's tyrannical barbarities. The Security Council considered Lebanon's complaint but failed to reach agreement because of the United States veto, cast against a purely humanitarian draft resolution, which read:

> "*The Security Council,*
>
> "...
>
> "1. *Reiterates* its call for strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;
>
> "2. *Affirms* that the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 apply to the territories

occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, . . .

"3. *Calls upon* Israel . . . to respect strictly the rights of the civilian population in the areas under its occupation in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, . . . "[11]

Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution demands the elimination of "all restrictions and obstacles to the restoration of normal conditions in the areas under its occupation, in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, . . . "[11]

65. According to the Western media, in southern Lebanon, Israel is in fact creating a new West Bank, a new Golan, a new Gaza Strip. By severing communications with the territories it occupies in southern Lebanon, Israel is flagrantly violating a fundamental principle of international law, namely, the right of every person to move around freely in his own country.

66. We wonder whether there is any difference at all between the Zionist practices in the Arab territories they have occupied since 1967 and the Nazi practices under which Europe suffered so much. Does the fourth Geneva Convention, which was drafted in light of the suffering of both Jews and non-Jews in Europe, apply only to Europe and to the United States, according to Israel's argument, and not to the occupied Arab territories? What is the difference between Israeli practices against the non-Jewish population and the practices of the Pretoria régime against the non-white citizens of South Africa and Namibia? That is why Israel has exploited the United States veto and viewed it as a reward for its violations of the rights of the people of southern Lebanon, humiliating them and ignoring all national interests.

67. We hail the struggle of the Lebanese people, which has thwarted the 17 May 1983 agreement and which will put an end to the Israeli occupation thanks to its heroic resistance, particularly in the south. It will succeed in ridding Lebanon of Israeli blackmail.

68. While the Security Council has been incapable of having its resolutions on Lebanon implemented, in particular resolution 509 (1982), Lebanese resistance, in exercising its well-established right to self-defence and to the liberation of its land, will for its part surely succeed in forcing the total and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all occupied Lebanese territory.

69. Israel would not have been able to practise its aggressive and expansionist policy had it not been for the unlimited support of the United States in the political, diplomatic, military and economic spheres. The strategic agreement concluded in November 1982 between Washington and Tel Aviv has become a military-strategic alliance in the full sense of the term, an alliance directed against the interests of the Arab nation and its right to live in peace, free from all threats and foreign Zionist occupation, and against its right to establish its own foreign relations on the basis of equality, justice and mutual respect.

70. United States aid to Israel has now risen to astronomical heights: $2.6 billion were handed over to Israel by Washington in the fiscal year beginning 1 October last. Almost half that amount—$1.2 billion—was in the form of economic assistance and $1.4 billion was in the form of military assistance. All this assistance is a gift from the United States Government and thus each Israeli citizen receives $672 a year in official American aid, the highest ratio in United States foreign aid to any State anywhere in the world. *The Christian Science Monitor*, on 24 October 1984, stated that in the current year the United States Congress had transformed all United States financial assistance into outright gifts and that since 1980 Washington had given Israel $29 billion, of which $11 billion was in the form of loans and the rest outright gifts. Moreover, the United States Congress in its budget legislation has called upon the Reagan Administration to pay $1.2 billion to Israel during the current quarter of the fiscal year, whereas United States aid to other countries is spread out over the full fiscal year. The United States Congress made this request in order to help Israel overcome its liquidity problems, which are very acute, with inflation running at the rate of about 1,000 per cent. According to *The New York Times* of 21 November, the rate of inflation could reach 1,260 per cent in 1985.

71. According to official sources, Israel in real terms pays a very low rate of interest on the loans it obtains, which means that the volume of United States aid constitutes really three times its face value. In other words, during the current fiscal year, American taxpayers will be giving Israel $7.8 billion. And if Peres had insisted on getting $4 billion in the form of assistance for 1986, which would as usual be converted into gifts by the United States Congress, this would have meant that a total of $12 billion would have been paid out by American taxpayers to Israel, thus securing to each Israeli citizen in the current year more than $3,000 from the American treasury. To this official aid must be added $1 billion in private tax-exempt aid per annum. It must also be remembered that Israel's foreign debt will rise from $23 billion in the current year to $41 billion by 1988. Israel's per capita foreign debt today is the highest in the world.

72. When we consider these figures we must take into account that the average per capita income among most of the States Members of the United Nations varies between $300 and $500 per annum. None the less, the Zionist lobby, known as the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee, has been making the Americans believe that they are indebted to Israel. According to *The Christian Science Monitor* of 24 October 1984:

> "The American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee, a lobbying group supporting Israel, contends that aid to Israel is vital to United States foreign policy objectives in the Middle East and important to Israel's survival as a free and independent ally. The political, military and economic interests of the United States, the Committee says, are served by strong alignment with Israel, the only politically stable democratic ally in the region. Foreign assistance is essential for sustaining and continuing the Middle East peace process; it represents America's ongoing investment in peace."*

73. Supplying Israel with financial aid on this scale means providing Israel with the means for aggression and expansion, enabling it to spread terror and destruction far and wide, and helping it maintain its occupation of the West Bank, the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip and southern Lebanon. It is not, as has been claimed, "an American investment in the peace process". Israel recognizes that the cost of its occupa-

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

tion of southern Lebanon is running to $1 million a day in normal circumstances. Thus it is the United States which has been financing Israeli aggression and enabling it to maintain its occupation. In fact, the United States has no investment and very little interest in peace.

74. Notwithstanding the steady flow of sophisticated weapons that has been reaching Israel from the United States and the strategic alliance which has mortgaged American power and policy for Israel's advantage, we the Arab peoples are prepared to press on with our struggle to recover our usurped rights. The Syrian Arab Republic fulfils its national responsibilities with all necessary courage and sincerity, because American-Zionist plans are aimed against Syria just as much as they are aimed against all the other Arab nations. We will spare no effort to oppose the mounting Israeli aggression so as to contain it and repel it. Peace will be restored in the region only on the basis of justice, not through a peace imposed on the region by force so as to subjugate it to the dominion of United States imperialist interests in the shadow of Israeli intransigence.

75. The success we have had in our resistance against the designs of imperialism for our region shows clearly that victory of the Arab popular will is certain.

76. We wish now to tell the United States quite clearly—as our delegation did during the general debate [*14th meeting*]—that insistence on solving the Middle East problem and the Palestinian question on the basis of the Camp David accords or in separate partial deals is causing increased tension in the region and making the situation even more dangerous, while enabling Israel to extend its settlements policy in the occupied Arab territories and to strike out in all directions. Israel has annexed Jerusalem and the Golan Heights and has invaded Lebanon, continuing to occupy large areas of that country, while at the same time undermining the legitimate role of the United Nations.

77. We cannot better express the Syrian attitude than to repeat the words of President Hafez al-Assad, who, in addressing the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, spoke about the difficult situation with which Syria has to cope owing to the Israeli invasion:

> "What Israel and the United States are seeking is a myth. The aspirations of the people to their homeland and legitimate rights cannot be buried by force of arms. The Palestinian people will continue to be a strong people defending its rights. The Palestinian cause will continue to be our cause—a cause that we shall defend with honour, without accepting compromise, without accepting its liquidation.
>
> "As for the brother people of Lebanon, we shall remain faithful to our obligations to that friendly people and help it with all available means to defend its freedom, independence and land. Syria will be the fortress on which all the efforts of the American imperialists and Zionists towards expansion and for the subjugation and oppression of the Arab people will be dashed.
>
> "Despite all appearances, I have confidence in a shining future and victory over the aggressor."

78. For its part, the General Assembly has constantly shown its awareness of the situation and understands what we have endured since our independence and the struggle in which we are engaged. We look for aid and assistance and appreciate what we have received. We seek from the current session understanding of our efforts to cope with this threat to the independence, freedom and territorial integrity of the Arab nations.

79. The resolutions of the General Assembly express the determination of the international community to find a just solution to the Middle East problem based on two fundamental principles underpinning the international order: the right to self-determination and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. It is therefore incumbent upon the Assembly—notwithstanding all the varied pressures on it—to have its relevant resolutions implemented. We are sure that the overwhelming majority has the political will to bring about the implementation of those resolutions, which strengthen international legitimacy, and will overcome the obstacles erected by circles hostile to the United Nations, primarily the United States and Israel.

80. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I must confess to some surprise, and more than a little puzzlement, at the two Middle East debates, the two separate debates, which are currently on our agenda. The first is called "The situation in the Middle East." The second is called "The question of Palestine", a highly tendentious way of referring to the Arab-Israeli dispute. I am puzzled because what I perhaps too naively expected to hear today was a genuine discussion about the overall situation in the Middle East. What I have heard instead is a deliberate rehearsal for the later and presumably distinct debate on the Arab-Israeli conflict. The two previous speakers in their "brief" remarks would have us believe that the Middle East is a paradise on earth, disturbed only by the Arab-Israeli dispute.

81. Now, I am happy, even eager, to discuss the Arab-Israeli dispute, but, if we are asked here to discuss the general situation in the Middle East, then by all means let us do so; let us look at the conditions that obtain in the many countries of the region, let us ponder what drives the various conflicts, let us consider the level of violence and its sources.

82. The Arab-Israeli dispute, even if considered under the deliberately misleading rubric of the "Palestinian problem", certainly merits appropriate attention. I intend to have my say on this matter in our upcoming debate on this topic. But at this time I should like to focus on the broader question which is the subject of today's discussion: the situation in the Middle East.

83. I plan to examine a single proposition that has been uncritically accepted by many—namely, that the "Palestinian problem" lies at the heart of the present unrest in the Middle East. Even many of those who know enough not to reduce the Arab-Israeli dispute to the much narrower question of the Palestinian Arabs still subscribe to the notion that in one way or another it drives or exacerbates all conflict in the region. We are frequently told that if we solve this problem, however it is defined, we shall have peace in the area, or at least a significant reduction in the level of violence and conflict. However plausible this idea may appear, it breaks down under closer examination.

84. In recent decades virtually every Arab State has been in conflict—in border disputes, subversion,

invasion or full-scale war—with at least one of its Arab neighbours. Not one part of the Arab world is an exception to this melancholy regularity.

85. In North Africa, Libya has clashed with Egypt and Tunisia, and, before its present bizarre marriage with Morocco, it supported the anti-Morocco Frente POLISARIO[12] forces. It threatens Sudan and recently bombed the Sudanese city of Omdurman. It has financed efforts to topple other Arab régimes and to assassinate Libyan exiles and other Arab leaders abroad. Egypt, in its radical days under Nasser, invaded Yemen and occupied it for eight years. It sought to subvert Jordan and destabilize Iraq and Syria. More recently, responding to Libyan attacks, it has clashed with Qaddafi, with whom it now trades threats. And Algeria, of course, has been waging surrogate warfare for years against Morocco, using the Frente POLISARIO in the Sahara.

86. What about the Arabian peninsula? There we have South Yemen, which regularly launches subversive forces into the Dhofar in an attempt to tear off that region from Oman. But the two Yemens, north and south, have been warring intermittently among themselves for years. And when not preoccupied with their fears of each other they worry about Saudi meddling and armed incursions into their territories. Saudi Arabia, while trying to buy off all potential enemies in the Arab world, in turn seeks to dominate not only both Yemens but the smaller States of the Gulf, against which it has pressed territorial claims. Kuwait frets over Saudi encroachment on its territory, but worries even more about Iraq, which invaded Kuwait in 1973 and still claims it in its entirety.

87. And in the heart of the Middle East, Syria's record rivals that of Libya. It has repeatedly threatened Jordan and even invaded it. It vilifies its fellow Baathists in Iraq and openly and tirelessly works to overthrow the régime in Baghdad. Its designs on smaller Lebanon are well known. These are not to topple a régime, already vassalized, or change a border, already ignored, but to swallow the country whole into a "Greater Syria". This is why Syria has never recognized Lebanon as a separate State since 1943, when both countries gained their independence, and why Syria today obstinately refuses to withdraw its troops from it. It has slaughtered those Lebanese who dared to oppose these designs—Christians, Muslims and Druze—with impeccable impartiality.

88. The object of Syrian hatred, Iraq, has been no slouch either. It has carried out an energetic campaign of subversion and terrorism against its Arab neighbours. While Iraq and Jordan are currently embracing each other, Iraq has sought to topple Jordan's monarch in the past, as it now seeks to overthrow Syria's Government, and from time to time it renews its claim to Kuwait.

89. Now, having considered the Arab régimes' behaviour towards each other, let us examine their record of behaviour towards their non-Arab neighbours. Let us look briefly at the three Arab States that are currently the most aggressive—Libya, Syria and Iraq.

90. Libya has invaded Chad, a non-Arab country, occupies a large part of its territory and refuses to pull out its troops despite specific promises. Qaddafi also trains special subversive units to bring down black African Governments. He has been implicated in plots as far afield as western and central Africa, and among his allies have been the likes of Idi Amin. And as was recently uncovered by the Egyptians, he has been engaged in a conspiracy on a global scale, commissioning the assassination not only of fellow Arab rulers in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates, but also of such non-Arab leaders as Margaret Thatcher, François Mitterrand, Helmut Kohl and Zia of Pakistan.

91. Like Libya, Syria's appetite is not limited to its fellow Arabs. Syria claims, for example, the region and city of Alexandretta which unquestionably belongs to non-Arab Turkey. Syria's Minister of Justice, Khalid Al-Malki, was quoted by the official Syrian Gazette, *Al Jarida Al Rasmiya*, of 9 December 1982, as saying that a recent extradition negotiation with Turkey "does not signify any recognition of the annexation of the Iskenderun district in Turkey or Turkey's control over that region." The Gazette goes on to quote Abdallah Shukri, a member of the Syrian Parliament, who helpfully explained: "We shall regain the district as soon as we settle the score with the Zionist enemy; we shall not tarry a moment."

92. And now we come to Iraq. In September 1980, Saddam Hussein perceived post-revolutionary Iran, another non-Arab country, as weak and ripe for plunder. He swiftly revoked the border agreement he had signed five years earlier with the Shah and invaded Iran's oil-rich provinces. The Iran-Iraq war has been raging now for more than four years, exacting a horrific toll in lives, and shows no sign of abating.

93. But the violence in the Middle East is not limited to aggression across borders. The Arab régimes have ready recourse to violence in dealing with internal opposition; thus, each Arab Government depends on force or the threat of violence to stay in power. A quick survey of the composition and record of the leadership in the Arab world demonstrates this point.

94. Libya is ruled by a colonel and a small clique of officers. The army runs Algeria. Hassan of Morocco depends on the loyalty of his military to sustain his rule. In Saudi Arabia not one, but two armies—they watch each other—protect the princes. In Syria an officer corps dominated by the minority Alawites suppresses dissent, sometimes with mass murder as at the city of Hama, where Assad's forces killed up to 25,000 civilians and according to *The New York Times*, "turned half the town into a parking lot". Hussein of Jordan relies on his Bedouin forces to subdue any threat to his rule. Hussein of Iraq depends on his secret police and army.

95. Furthermore, virtually every Arab leader has been the target of attempted or successful assassination. The list of victims and intended victims includes kings—Faisal of Iraq, Faisal of Saudi Arabia, Hassan of Morocco and Hussein of Jordan; presidents—Qassem of Iraq, Nimeiri of Sudan, Boumédienne of Algeria, Bourguiba of Tunisia, Gemayel of Lebanon, Sadat of Egypt, Ghamsi of Yemen, Qaddafi of Libya and Shishakli, Zaim and Assad of Syria; prime ministers—Tal and Majali of Jordan and Said of Iraq; and sundry untitled rulers such as Al-Hamdi of North Yemen. For the sake of brevity, I omit the countless successful and attempted assassinations of lesser ministers, opposition leaders, intellectuals, journalists, diplomats and minor officials.

96. Like the violence that extends across borders, domestic violence in the Arab world also extends to non-Arabs, for the Arabs regard the area from Morocco to the Persian Gulf as belonging exclusively to them, despite the presence of numerous peoples that make up a sizeable portion of the population—Berbers, Kurds, Copts, Druze, Jews, Circassians, Assyrians, Christians, blacks and others. These non-Arab or non-Muslim peoples can be accepted only in a state of subjugation, within a dominant Arab-Muslim domain, never as independent equals.

97. Those peoples who in past years have refused to accept such an arrangement were suppressed, often bloodily. Earlier in this century, in 1932, the Iraqi régime massacred the ancient Assyrian community and incited the Arab population to murder those who escaped the official slaughter and to plunder their property. More recently, the Kurds, another ancient non-Arab people with a distinctive history, culture and language, were mercilessly crushed by Iraq in their bid for independence. In its nine-year war against the Kurds, from 1961 to 1970, the Iraqi army killed tens of thousands, left some 200,000 homeless and forcibly resettled large numbers of Kurds in the Gezira region—and, by the way, they gave the property vacated by the Kurds to Arabs. Even so, despite the attempts to destroy them, the Kurds continue their efforts to achieve independence to this very day.

98. Even more tragic has been the fate of the 500,000 non-Muslim blacks in the southern part of the Sudan who perished in the nine-year rebellion, from 1963 to 1972, against the domination of the northern Arabs. Recently, new decrees by the Sudanese Government have rekindled fears of renewed bloodshed.

99. Perhaps most worrying about all this violence in the Middle East is that many of its practitioners recognize no limits, either in the means or in the targets chosen. As to means, it can hardly be a coincidence that two of the very rare cases in which gas warfare has been used since the First World War were both in the Middle East. Nasser used gas in Yemen in the early 1960s, and more recently Iraq has repeatedly gassed Iranian troops, as United Nations investigations have confirmed.

100. Nor does Arab violence appear to know limits in its field of operations. Radical Arab enemies of Egypt apparently mined the international waterway of the Red Sea, and the victims of their mines have been the ships of a dozen countries. In the Persian Gulf, the Iraqis have been openly—defiantly—bombing the neutral shipping of many countries, killing and wounding countless innocent seamen in the process. The Iranians, of course, have been answering in kind.

101. Finally, we should not forget that Middle Eastern export upon which no cartel has set limits—terrorism, whose practitioners everywhere emulate Middle Eastern models; but contrary to popular perception, the primary focus of Arab terrorism has been other Arabs. To quote Muhsen Muhammad, editor of the Egyptian daily *Al Gomhouria*, on 29 October 1984:

> "The number of terrorist organizations in the Arab and Muslim world has grown. These are organizations which kill Arabs and Muslims everywhere . . . some of these were created by governments to kill opponents, adversaries, émigrés and refugees in all countries of the world."

Indeed, Arab terrorism now encompasses the entire non-communist world. Its victims are as likely to be attacked and innocent bystanders killed on the streets of London, or Paris, or New Delhi, or Rio. No one and no place is immune from this plague.

102. What we now have before us is a picture that is unpleasant to contemplate but that must be understood. Violence is a fact of political life in the Arab world. It is the primary method of dealing with enemies, both foreign and domestic, both Arab and non-Arab.

103. No one, of course, should confuse Tunisia with Libya or Kuwait with Iraq. Not all Arab régimes are the same, obviously. Some are predatory, some are more often prey. But we cannot avert our eyes from the general record of assassinations, subversion, coups, terrorism and outright war—and the frequent absence of limits in the conduct of this warfare. This, I am afraid, is what we must examine first in considering the situation in the Middle East.

104. It will be noted that in my survey so far of the violence that pervades the region I have not mentioned the Arab-Israeli dispute. The reason is simple. None of the conflicts I have mentioned has anything to do with Israel. None of this violence has Israel as its target—Israeli leaders, I might add, did not even merit a position on Qaddafi's recent hit list—yet most of the discussions about achieving "peace" in the Middle East focus exclusively on the Arab-Israeli conflict and ignore the pervasive violence that characterizes the Arab world.

105. I am not suggesting—let me be clear on that—that the Arab-Israeli dispute is separate from this general pattern. I am suggesting that it is a manifestation of a larger problem. That problem consists of two elements: first, the propensity of Arab political culture to employ violence to resolve conflicts at all levels; and, secondly, the Arabs' refusal to contemplate any non-Arab sovereignty in their midst, whatever its borders—a refusal which remains, unhappily, almost unanimous.

106. While the specific enmity to Israel is deeply rooted in this general intolerance, Israel's sin is particularly odious in Arab eyes. For the Jews of Israel are the only non-Arab people to have successfully defied Arab domination and achieved independence. Thus, the very existence of Israel challenges the concept of a unified and uninterrupted Arab domain. Even the presumed champion of Palestinian statehood, Yasser Arafat—whose bitterly divided PLO, by the way, is a leading example of Arab internecine warfare and murder—has said: "The question of borders does not interest us. Palestine is only a small drop in the great Arab ocean. Our nation is the great Arab nation extending from the Atlantic to the Red Sea and beyond."

107. It is this opposition to any non-Arab sovereignty in this "great Arab nation" that is at the root of the Arab-Israeli conflict. This is why for 30 years, before there was a Jewish State, before there was a single Arab refugee, the Arabs mercilessly attacked Jewish towns and villages. This is why they later went to war three times against the State of Israel before there was a single settlement, before there was a single Israeli soldier in the Golan Heights or in Judea-Samaria, as indeed both these territories were then firmly in Arab hands. The Arab campaign

against Israel is rooted not in a negotiable grievance but in the basic opposition to Israel's very existence. The problem of the Palestinian Arabs, therefore, even when considered within the proper context of the Arab-Israeli dispute, is not the root of that dispute but merely one of its results.

108. Could it be argued that, despite the evidence of other conflicts, the Arab-Israeli conflict none the less deserves our primary attention because of the level of casualties? Here, too, we must examine the facts. The total number of fatalities in all the Arab-Israeli wars over 36 years is some 50,000, Arabs and Israelis combined. While each life lost is a tragedy, the cost pales before the staggering losses elsewhere.

109. Let me explain what I am talking about. The Iran-Iraq war, in four years, has claimed a minimum of 200,000 lives, not to mention hundreds of thousands of persons wounded and permanently disabled. Egypt's invasion of Yemen and the civil war there claimed the lives of 200,000 Yemenis and some 30,000 Egyptian troops. The toll exacted by the Lebanese civil war was 100,000 dead. In the Sudan alone, half a million died. And nobody knows the exact number of Kurds slaughtered by Iraq.

110. So, the next time someone blithely assures us that the "Palestinian problem" is the "core" of the Middle East conflict, we have a right to demand of the speaker which conflict he has in mind. Let us, in fact, ask him some further questions. What does the Palestinian problem have to do with Nasser's invasion of Yemen? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with Iraq's massacre of the Kurds, its intermittent claim to Kuwait and its invasion of Iran? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with Algeria's support of the Frente POLISARIO[12] in the Western Sahara? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with Saudi Arabia's encroachment on the two Yemens? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with Libya's seizure of northern Chad, or its bombing of the Sudan, or its clash with Tunisia, or its conflict with Egypt? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with Syria's designs on Jordan? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with the slaughter of Sudanese blacks by Sudanese Arabs? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with Syria's claim to all of Lebanon? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with the explosive hatred between Damascus and Baghdad? What does the Palestinian problem have to do with the slaughter of Sunni dissidents in the Syrian city of Hama? We should ask all these questions because to ask them is to begin to answer them.

111. I began my remarks by observing that we have been called here to consider two questions: first, to examine the general situation in the Middle East; secondly, to discuss what has been called the "Palestinian problem".

112. It is often suggested that the general turbulence and violence in the Middle East is a result of the Arab-Israeli conflict, that, in other words, the first question originates in the second. All of the evidence, however—and I have adduced only the most important facts here: facts, not opinions—suggests that the relationship is exactly the reverse. The Arab-Israeli dispute—or, as some would have it, the "Palestinian problem"—can only be understood in the general context of Arab political practice and attitudes. It is but one case, though clearly the best publicized, out of all the many examples of Arab violence and intolerance.

113. These are the forces which are responsible, as we have seen, not only for the Arab-Israeli conflict but for much else in the Middle East. The real focus of our debate should be the ways to control these underlying tendencies from claiming still more innocent victims and inflicting still more suffering everywhere from Morocco to the Gulf.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[2] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510.

[3] *Ibid., Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14002.

[4] *Ibid., Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15403.

[5] *Ibid.*, document S/15317.

[6] *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), annex I, sect. H, para. 16.

[7] Boston, South End Pr., 1983.

[8] New York, Times Books, 1983.

[9] *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1973*, document S/11040.

[10] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[11] *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1984*, document S/16732.

[12] Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

73rd
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 26 November 1984,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

1. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is known that international events and developments are not confined to the region of the Middle East, but the events and developments in that area have a general feature that distinguishes them from others—namely, the characteristic of continuance, repetition and accumulation. It is impossible not to note that those events and developments are united by a common denominator. This is that they all spring from one source, which is the chain of continuous Israeli acts of aggression; from one doctrine, which is the Zionist doctrine; and from one policy, which is the policy of cutting off the meat of the prey piece by piece, or what is known in diplomatic tradition as the policy of imposing *faits accomplis* one after another.

2. All these events and developments are aimed at one ultimate goal, which is the realization of zionism's great dream: the establishment of Greater Israel. It is the attempts to realize that dream that have changed the region of the Middle East into a bloody theatre in which Israel, with a military arsenal out of all proportion to its size, plays a continuing aggressive role that has occupied the attention of the United Nations for more than 37 years, leaving it confused and unable to decide what to do about this Member State, the only one whose membership was conditional on its permitting the return of the Palestinian refugees to their homes, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 194 (III), of 11 December 1948. In spite of that, by its refusal to implement that resolution and by its persistence in aggression, Israel has earned the title of the enemy of peace in the Middle East. The General Assembly confirmed this in paragraph 12 of resolution 37/123 A, in which it again determined that Israel is not a peace-loving Member State.

3. Ever since 1948, when zionism appropriated by force a large part of the Arab Palestinian lands for the establishment of the Jewish State, that intruder has committed aggression after aggression in order to seize another slice of Palestinian or Arab land, after strengthening its hold on the piece it had already annexed. The effects of the series of Israeli acts of aggression are clear and numerous. One such effect is the many international forces spread over the map of the Middle East, including UNTSO, UNDOF and UNIFIL.

4. The presence of those forces, which are found everywhere in the Middle East, is evidence of the continuous aggressive activity of the Zionists in the Arab region. It is that activity that has made the history of the second half of this century a chain of bloody military adventures through which Israel strives to expand its territory under the pretext of maintaining peace and security. Israel's arrogant talk about peace and security seems contrary to reason and logic in the light of what it represents—namely, a militarily aggressive striking force with many times the power of that of others many times its size.

5. If we take a quick glance at the map of the Middle East we find the following incriminating facts.

6. First, aggression still exists, as represented in the continuing Israeli occupation, since 1967, of Palestinian and Arab territories and its flagrant violations of the Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

7. Secondly, the Israeli practices aimed at changing the physical, demographic and legal character of the various Arab and Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967 are still going on, despite the fact that Israel is thereby flagrantly violating the rules of international law, in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[1], and scoffing at the annual condemnation by the United Nations in resolutions demanding that Israel cease those illegal practices.

8. Thirdly, Al-Quds al-Sharif, which is considered the principal part of the occupied territories, has been illegally annexed and declared by Israel to be its capital, despite the adoption by the United Nations each year of resolutions denouncing that act, declaring it null and void and demanding that Israel rescind it.

9. Fourthly, the Arab Syrian Golan Heights are still occupied and Israel still implements Israeli laws there, in contravention of the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

10. Fifthly, the barbaric Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982—the latest of the criminal, bloody Israeli series—has further exacerbated the crisis by expanding the area of the territory subjected to illegal Israeli practices in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Arab Syrian Golan Heights to include southern Lebanon, whose people have been made the latest victims of that aggressive series.

11. Sixthly—and last but not least—the Palestinian question, which derives from the creation by force of the Jewish State on Arab Palestinian territories, is

still unresolved despite the many United Nations resolutions emphasizing the central nature of this question in the Middle East crisis and the impossibility of achieving a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in that region without the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights.

12. We do not doubt for one minute that the United Nations has made continuous efforts to face what is happening in the Middle East. In fact, it has confronted the accumulating record of aggressive acts by this curious State, with all it contains of abhorrent colonialist aggression, implanted in the heart of our Arab region with a growing number of resolutions dealing with every form of that aggression.

13. If we try to discover the reasons for the failure so far to halt the continuing Israeli aggression or to ensure implementation of United Nations resolutions adopted for that purpose, we have to face three inexorable facts which have been repeatedly mentioned whenever the Middle East problem has been debated. Those facts are the following.

14. First, the international community's inability—as the Secretary-General has stated in his latest report on the work of the Organization [*A/39/1*]—to solve many of its problems has given rise to a process of side-stepping the United Nations and recourse to other measures, such as the use of force, unilateral action and military alliances, which has weakened reliance on the Organization. The Secretary-General goes on to say that the non-implementation of resolutions and their proliferation tends to lead Governments and peoples to look at the United Nations with less seriousness. Those remarks relate in a special way to the conflict in the Middle East, because of the hostilities and feelings of frustration involved.

15. Kuwait, which supports those remarks by the Secretary-General, also supports the part of his report on the situation in the Middle East [*A/39/600*] in which he states that the continuing failure to solve the problem of the situation there reflects adversely on the authority and status of the United Nations.

16. Secondly, some major Powers which are linked to Israel by special relations—for example, the United States—always seek to protect Israel regardless of its colonialist settlement and arbitrarily coercive policies. That protection takes many forms, but we shall cite only the following: (*a*) the imposition of unacceptable pre-conditions on participation by the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*], which is recognized internationally as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in any negotiations to resolve the Palestinian question, in spite of the fact that the General Assembly has repeatedly emphasized in its relevant resolutions that it will not be possible to establish a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region without the participation on a basis of equality of all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO; (*b*) the rejection of agreement on an international framework for negotiations on peace in the Middle East owing to the fear that such a conference might lead to the imposition of a solution not acceptable to Israel; the United States, as well as Israel, rejected the invitation of the Secretary-General, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, of 13 December 1983, to participate in an international peace conference on the Middle East, in which the United States, the Soviet Union, the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, and other countries concerned would participate; (*c*) the use of the veto against any draft resolution in the Security Council aimed at denouncing Israel and punishing it for its illegal policies; the right of veto has been exercised this year even against draft resolutions which have not denounced Israel but merely called upon it to stop some of its practices: on 29 February 1984, the veto was used against a French draft resolution calling for the creation of an international force to take the place of the multinational forces after their withdrawal; on 6 September 1984, this right was used again against a Lebanese draft resolution affirming the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the territories occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon and demanding that Israel lift all restrictions and obstacles to the restoration of normal conditions in the areas under its occupation in southern Lebanon; and (*d*) supplying Israel, despite its shameful aggressive record, with the latest means of destruction produced by the American military industry in such a way as to ensure its permanent quantitative and qualitative supremacy over the collective Arab forces. It is worth noting that the General Assembly, in its resolution 38/180 A, called upon all Member States to put an end to the flow of military, economic and financial aid to Israel. Despite that, the United States has not been satisfied with increasing the volume of economic and military aid to Israel this year, but has confronted us with a unique situation in which the strategic alliance recently concluded between the United States and Israel has been strengthened.

17. The third fact we must face is Israel's stubbornness and rejection of all international laws in order to achieve its ultimate goals in the region. Its arrogant behaviour towards the international community is explained by the huge support provided to it by the United States in the political, military, financial and economic fields.

18. It is the opinion of my delegation that Israel would be too cowardly to defy the international community with such boldness and arrogance if it did not have United States support. The existence of a special relationship between two States Members of the United Nations is a private matter that concerns those two Members alone. But when this special relationship aggravates an already dangerous situation in an area as sensitive as the Middle East—the latest example of which was the barbaric invasion of Lebanon in 1982—the international community should obviously step in and halt those Israeli policies, on which dozens of resolutions have been adopted. And the United States, which played a major part in the creation of Israel and has continued to support it until it has become a beast of prey, should now assume responsibility not only for putting pressure on Israel until it bows to the international will but also for finding a solution to the main problem which arose from the creation of Israel—namely, the Palestinian question. Unless this pivotal problem is solved, a comprehensive, just and lasting peace will never be possible.

19. The situation cannot remain as it is indefinitely, since, as the Secretary-General says in his report [*A/39/600*], it has an adverse effect on the world Organization.

20. But in the midst of the darkness a gleam of hope seems to appear. For the first time in many years the United Nations is facing the situation in the Middle East with a clearly outlined programme of action

which calls for the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East attended by all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries concerned.

21. The Geneva Declaration on Palestine, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983,[2] also constitutes a central element of the method adopted by the United Nations for solving the Palestinian question, which is the core of the Middle East problem.

22. Kuwait believes that it is the duty of the States Members of the United Nations, whether individually or collectively, to promote the holding of this conference. The first thing is to persuade the countries which did not agree to the convening of such a conference to change their opinion by pointing out that to reject any framework for peace is to refuse to discuss ways of restoring peace and security to a region which has already suffered so much and whose stability is a condition of world peace and security. That is why Kuwait supported the Soviet call for the holding of an international conference to resolve the Middle East problem, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, on a footing of equality.

23. The consolidation of the international will, on the basis of this sound model for resolving the world's problems, could lead to a just and honourable end to this complicated problem. At this juncture, we do not see any justification for the major Powers directly involved evading this responsibility. The time has come for a just, long-awaited solution so that the Middle East may resume its traditional role in the evolution of civilization.

24. I should like to comment on the statement made by the representative of the Zionist entity this morning [*72nd meeting*] in the discussion of this important item by the General Assembly and to review the developments which have occurred or may occur.

25. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

26. Mr. BINAH (Israel): I just wish to draw the attention of the representative of Kuwait to the fact that the name of my country is Israel. It is a State Member of the United Nations and should be referred to by its correct name.

27. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Kuwait to please continue bearing in mind what has just been said.

28. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In discussing this important item in the General Assembly and reviewing the events that have occurred and that may occur in the course of making tangible progress towards a just solution of the Middle East problem, we find that the representative of the Israeli entity has, according to his custom, in a manner both boring and despicable and in order to distract the attention of the international community from the item under consideration, resorted to demagogery, the latest manifestation of which we heard a few moments ago. He has strayed far from the path of logic by attacking all the Arab countries, from the Arab East, the Mashreq, to the Arab West, the Maghreb, describing them in words that only Israel can use.

29. Israel's aggressive policy in the Middle East is a glaring example of an entity that has adopted terrorism and subversion as a means of realizing its schemes. Israel's numerous criminal acts in this regard have been recorded in United Nations documents in terms which do not call for further comment.

30. The core of all the problems of the Middle East can be found in the implantation of this foreign body of Israel in the Arab world body. The Arab world rejects this alien entity. The international community, as represented by the General Assembly, is fully aware of the background of that alien entity and its aggressive policies.

31. The representatives of Israel have revealed themselves by their inability, for years, to speak about the substance of the problem, its causes and consequences, and its victims, the Palestinian people.

32. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Back in 1947, the United Nations, having decided to put an end to the colonial domination of Great Britain in Palestine, decided to establish upon its territory two independent States, the Arab and the Jewish. But the designs and the aggressive actions of the imperialists and the Zionists converted the region of the Middle East into a constantly smouldering hotbed of war and conflict which, so far, has given no leeway for the Arab people of Palestine to exercise their inalienable right to statehood.

33. From the moment of its creation, Israel has waged aggressive wars against all of its neighbouring Arab countries and has conducted a policy of State terrorism against the Arab people of Palestine. As formerly, in America, there was mass expulsion and annihilation of Indians, thus, now, Israel is carrying out that same policy against the Arab population in the occupied territories, against the Palestinians in particular. Israeli military forces are annihilating innocent children, women and the elderly; this is taking place also in refugee camps. The Arabs are being expelled from their houses and the land that belongs to them, and in their place military garrisons and Israeli militarized settlements are being established. This is happening on the Golan Heights, on the West Bank of the Jordan, in the Gaza Strip and on Lebanese soil. For instance, according to information in the report of the Secretary-General: "by now almost all of the Jordan Valley's potentially cultivable land has been expropriated for the Israeli settlements" [*A/39/233, para. 8*]. Israeli military authorities are carrying out collective punishment of Arabs. Prisons and concentration camps are filled. Those arrested and detained are tortured cruelly and Israel is blatantly flouting the 1949 Geneva conventions on the plight of war victims.

34. Those and other crimes of Israel against the Arab peoples of the occupied territories have frequently been vigorously condemned in resolutions of the United Nations and in other international forums. Demands that such practices should cease are ignored by the Israeli authorities.

35. The unsettled nature of the situation in the Near East, the core problem of which is the question of Palestine, can be laid at the door of American imperialism, which is encouraging Israel to commit its criminal acts against the Arab peoples.

36. The General Assembly, in paragraph 10 of resolution 38/180 D, adopted on 19 December 1983, justly emphasized that:

> "agreements on strategic co-operation between the United States of America and Israel signed on 30 November 1981, together with the recent accords concluded in this context, would encourage Israel to pursue its aggressive and expansionist policies and practices in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, would have adverse effects on efforts for the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East and would threaten the security of the region."

And that is how things happened.

37. Aggressive actions against Lebanon and the Palestinians in Lebanon are continuing. Repressions in other Israeli-occupied Arab territories are in progress. New Israeli settlements are being created there. The United States is itself firing on and bombing Lebanese soil. They are engaging in back-room intrigues, forcing Arabs to accept separate deals. They are undermining the unity of action of those who fight for a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East situation. The United States has frustrated the possibility of implementing United Nations decisions concerning the convening of an international world conference on the Middle East. To quote their own words: "The United States does not intend to participate in a conference of that kind or in any work connected with its preparation." Standing with them, of course, were Israel and certain of their closest allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

38. One can discern an overall policy to build up international tensions and intensify military preparations. This is being done everywhere: thus, for instance, in Western Europe it takes the form of deployment of additional American first-strike nuclear missile systems and the fomenting of militarism and revanchism. As a matter of fact, the Middle East happens to be within range of those American nuclear missiles. It is being done in the Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf and in the other regions adjacent to the Near East. Israel, for its part, is given the role of obedient executor of the expansionist policy and even of "protector" of American "vital interests" in this region.

39. It is clear that Israel, with all of its aggressiveness, deriving from Zionist concepts of exclusiveness and grandiosity, could not commit its lawlessness against Arab peoples without American support. After all, this is a country with a stagnating economy and galloping inflation, where prices are rising at the rate of 1,000 per cent per year; a country where the foreign debt exceeds the annual budget and is higher than any if calculated on a per capita basis; a country with a constant multi-billion balance of payments deficit; a country where production is growing twice as slowly as consumption. And yet, Israel is expending approximately 30 per cent of its budget on military purposes. Where do the funds come from? Consider the election platform of the Republican Party of the United States. There you will read: "We promise to help maintain the quality of the military superiority of Israel over its opponents." In this case, the promises are kept. Approximately one third of all American "aid" to foreign States goes precisely in that direction, and most recently all of that aid has been granted to Israel on a non-refundable basis. The American Administration really does not care what the American taxpayer will have to pay for all of this. Yet, according to data in the British newspaper, the *Financial Times*, of 17 January 1984, the levels of American unilateral payments on a per capita basis to Israel are higher than the whole of the per capita income in the majority of the developing countries. The rulers of Israel are earning these pieces of silver with the blood and suffering of the Arab peoples and also by reducing to nothing the security of the Israeli people itself.

40. But is the American-Israeli "strategic alliance" so powerful that the people of the Middle East must yield to the aggressor? We are convinced that this is not so. There are forces in the world which can and must stop the unbridled aggressor and its protector.

41. As was pointed out recently by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Konstantin U. Chernenko:

> "The tense complicated situation in the Near East, the uneasy struggle which the Arabs have to wage against the aggressive designs of Israel and the actions of the United States again and again underline the significance of close mutual action of the Arab countries and their solidarity."

42. The just cause of the Arab peoples has extensive international support, which is apparent from the activities of the United Nations, other international organizations and the determined and constructive initiatives of both the Arab States and other States. This cannot be overlooked by those who speak and vote against the need for the speedy achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict and the solution of the Palestinian question by means of the exercise in practice of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people, the sole legitimate representative of which is the PLO, to self-determination and to establish its own independent State on Palestinian lands which would be freed on the West Bank of the Jordan, including East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.

43. The United Nations has on many occasions reaffirmed the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign lands through aggression. Accordingly, all Arab lands occupied by Israel since 1967 must be returned to the Arabs and the Israeli settlements which have been set up there must be dismantled. The borders between Israel and its Arab neighbours should be declared inviolable and guaranteed.

44. I shall not dwell on all of the aspects of the settlement of the Middle East question and the solution of the Palestinian question which are contained in the proposals of the Soviet Union of 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*]. Nor will I speak at length on the decisions adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.[3] I merely stress that in them we see a like-mindedness of approach between the socialist and Arab countries to the settlement of the Middle East question. I should like to refer to certain additional aspects which relate to the earliest possible attainment of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East problem.

45. Together with the cessation of the occupation by Israel of all Arab territories held since 1967, there must be firm guarantees of the right of all States in the region to secure and independent existence and development, with, of course, full reciprocity, as the

genuine security of some cannot be ensured by violating the security of others.

46. There must be an end to the state of war, and peace should be established between the Arab States and Israel. This means that all parties to the conflict, including Israel and the Palestinian State, should commit themselves to honour each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and to resolve by peaceful means, through talks, the disputes that have arisen.

47. International guarantees of the settlement should be drawn up and adopted. The role of guarantor could be assumed, for example, by the permanent members of the Security Council or by the Security Council as a whole.

48. All these and other questions pertaining to a settlement in the Middle East could be resolved by a set of collective efforts, but not by imposing upon the Arabs various kinds of separate deals with Israel. In other words, it is necessary to convene an international conference with the participation of all the parties concerned on an equal footing.

Mr. Al-Sabbagh (Bahrain), Vice-President, took the Chair.

49. The current session of the General Assembly, as we see it, must again reaffirm its attitude of principle concerning the solution of the Middle East question. It must condemn firmly and in specific terms those who prevent its settlement, and it must outline additional measures for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East for the purpose of preparing and signing a treaty or treaties encompassing the following components for settlement which are an integral part of it: the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967; the exercise of the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to the creation of its own State; the restoration of a state of peace, and the guaranteeing of the security and the independent development of all States parties to the conflict. At the same time, it is necessary to elaborate and adopt international guarantees of compliance with such a settlement. All agreements reached at the conference must represent an indivisible whole approved by all the parties—in other words, Syria, Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon, Israel, the PLO, the Soviet Union, the United States and other possible participants at the conference.

50. Such a conference on the Middle East should be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations. We call upon all parties to the conflict to act on the basis of a sober-minded understanding of each other's lawful rights and interests and on all other States not to hinder but to promote the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

51. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is indeed difficult to discuss the current situation in the Middle East without mentioning what is the core of the problem and of the conflict in the region: the Palestinian cause. The contemporary Arab-Israeli conflict derives basically from this major humanitarian issue, which was brought about by concerted efforts and which resulted in the loss of an entire homeland, the deportation of its people and their dispersal from their homes without the slightest qualm or logic.

52. In spite of the complications of this great tragedy, Israel was not content with occupying the Palestinian territories in 1948 but has endeavoured, relying on external support from certain well-known sources, to create even more problems for the Arab countries, especially for its neighbours. It ignited the flames of strife and war until it managed to occupy other Arab lands in 1967 and 1973, as it has in the wake of its recent military intervention in Lebanon.

53. Israel's occupation of the territories of Palestine, as well as parts of the territories of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt, is a clear sign of the dangers inherent in the current situation in the Middle East and is definitely the cause of acute tension and a threat to international peace and security.

54. The indigenous populations of Palestine and the occupied Arab territories are in fact innocent, defenceless people whose fate is controlled and dominated by Israel, driven as it is by expansionist and aggressive designs. Israel is striving to break the bonds tying those unarmed people to their land, country, government, nation and creed. Israel does not hesitate to use any method, tactic and ruse to realize its schemes, however arbitrary and repressive they may be. It turns a deaf ear to international appeals and resolutions seeking to foster an atmosphere conducive to stability and security in this critical part of the world instead of a climate of conflict, war and destruction.

55. Israeli practices against the populations of the occupied Arab territories have been condemned in various reports and forums and are contrary to all international laws and conventions. The reports of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, as well as the decisions of the Commission on Human Rights, the Security Council, the General Assembly, UNRWA, UNESCO and other credible international organizations and bodies, are clear proof of what we maintain.

56. Based upon all the firm evidence before us, we must all categorically reject the demolishing by force of the homes of Arab citizens in the occupied Arab territories perpetrated by the Israeli authorities. We must call for the release of all Arab prisoners in Israeli prisons. We must call for the application to all those citizens of the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[1] We call on Israel to refrain from any activity or measure which may alter the legal status, geographic nature or demographic structure of the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, the West bank of the River Jordan, Taba, southern Lebanon and the villages and cities of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

57. The international community must apply pressure on Israel to rescind its unlawful and arbitrary measures against educational institutions in the occupied Arab territories, to allow all those persons from the occupied areas who have been deported and banished to return to their homes and families without discrimination and, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, to pay reparations for the expropriated property of those who choose not to be repatriated.

58. The protracted conflict afflicting the Middle East has caused innumerable political, social and economic problems for the countries of the region.

Increasing doubts remain about Israel's bona fides when it says it is ready to accept a just and honourable peace, for, had it truly desired peace, it would have taken positive steps towards this end years and years ago.

59. The Arab countries understand peace and call for it on the basis of reason and logic, whereas Israel seeks a peace based on an opposite premise, that of power and supremacy. This is undoubtedly an unacceptable proposition because it widens the distance between the ideas that could be brought to bear by the parties directly concerned, and their direct participation in an international peace conference attended by other influential international parties is indispensable for the realization of a truly comprehensive peace.

60. The Sultanate of Oman has always abided by its position of principle in support of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the rights of the Arab countries, important parts of whose territories are occupied by Israel. We believe in the right of all peoples to choose their own future freely and without coercion. We welcome all steps for dialogue and peace, and hence we support the Egyptian initiative for peace. We would have wished Israel not to hamper the lofty objectives of that important step, as it is continuing to do. We have supported the call for the convening of an international peace conference in Geneva, so long as this meeting is attended by all the parties to the conflict. We have sought the realization of the Arab peace plan which was unanimously adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.[3] We have also accepted other positive peaceful initiatives which could be accepted by all of the concerned parties, especially the initiative of President Reagan, of 1 September 1982,[4] as well as those of some of the permanent members of the Security Council, whenever they have taken into account, in a tangible manner, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the peoples of the Arab territories occupied by Israel, the right of the peoples of the Middle East to live in peace, harmony and justice without any kind of outside intervention or pressure from any source.

61. As we are discussing the question of the Middle East, it is appropriate for me to refer to the fact that, after certain unfortunate difficulties, the Palestine National Council is meeting, in the Jordanian capital, to discuss the achievements and experience of recent years along the path of the defence of the Palestinian cause. We wish all success to this important conference in order to safeguard the interests and future of the Palestinian people, the interests of the Arab nation and world peace.

62. The fifth session of the Supreme Council of the Co-operation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf will take place in Kuwait from 27 to 29 November of this year. The sixth session will take place in November 1985 at Muscat, the capital of Oman. There is no doubt that the six countries of the Council—Saudi Arabia, Oman, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates—will continue to seek stability in the Gulf region, the Arab peninsula and the Middle East in general, since we believe in our role, which is to serve Arab and Islamic interests and contribute to the maintenance of world peace.

63. In conclusion, I would like to commend the efforts of the Arab countries of the Middle East to make a reality of the concept of historic interdependence and joint action. In this context, we welcome the restoration of the natural ties between two fraternal countries, Egypt and Jordan, and the restoration of similar ties between other Arab countries and Egypt. We applaud the important role played by the Secretary-General and the relevant organs of the United Nations in the interests of justice and peace in the region. Such positive efforts as are mentioned by the Secretary-General in his report [*A/39/600*] underline the need to pursue endeavours to establish peace and stability and to quell hotbeds of tension and war. We acclaim in particular the role of UNDOF and of the international force working for the maintenance of peace. We hope that the current talks taking place in Naqoura, Lebanon, under United Nations auspices will succeed in bringing about a complete and speedy Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon. We are grateful for the activities of UNRWA and wish it all success in the realization of its noble humanitarian endeavours. We support the sincere efforts of committees of the United Nations to monitor and follow-up the question of Palestine and the occupied Arab territories and the situation in the Middle East in general. Here I refer particularly to the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and other relevant bodies.

64. This morning [*72nd meeting*] the representative of Israel referred *inter alia* to matters totally unconnected with the realities in the Middle East. The aggression carried out by his country was manifest when he spoke about discord between certain Arab countries and between Iraq and Iran, as fraternal Islamic countries. He mentioned the relationship between my country and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

65. In this regard, I must reaffirm that such statements are only an attempt to escape reality. I must reaffirm to the representative of Israel and others that the unfortunate events that may occur between two fraternal Arab countries are normal events that take place within the framework of one Arab family. The representative of Israel has no cause to intervene in such affairs. Fraternal relations exist between Oman and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. We have a common destiny and a common position, since we signed an agreement at the Foreign Ministers level on 27 October 1982 in the capital of Kuwait. That agreement consolidates stable relationships between our two countries.

66. We sincerely hope that all the causes that led to the Middle East conflict will be eliminated and also that certain unfortunate problems that may have arisen between brotherly Arab countries will be settled.

67. Mr. BUGTI (Pakistan):* The Middle East question is undoubtedly one of the gravest and most intractable problems that the United Nations has ever had to face and deal with. The General Assembly has probably spent more time and given more attention to it than to any other. Thirty-seven years have elapsed since the United Nations was first called upon to deal with it. During this period, five wars have been fought in the region and yet, due to

---

*Mr. Bugti spoke in Urdu. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

the intransigence of one of the parties, a settlement is nowhere in sight.

68. Because of its location and its natural resources, the Middle East today is an area of great strategic value. Any fresh outbreak of hostilities, which would be more destructive than the previous conflicts, could even lead to a confrontation between the two super-Powers and have the most serious consequences for the whole world. The present no-peace, no-war situation in the region therefore poses a threat not only to the region but also to the peace and security of the whole world.

69. The responsibility for this state of affairs must be borne by Israel, whose aggressive and expansionist policies and repression of the Arab population in the occupied territories have kept the whole region on the brink of a catastrophic conflict. Israel has dismissed with contempt the resolutions adopted by the United Nations year after year, which have outlined the principles of a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East and have set out the guidelines for their implementation. In complete defiance of the will of the international community, it has refused to withdraw from the occupied territories and has annexed Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights. Its plans to set up settlements in the West Bank make it clear that its ultimate objective is no less than the Judaization of all the Palestinian territories seized by it in an insatiable drive for more and more land.

70. Israel's aggressive and expansionist designs were demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt by its invasion of Lebanon two years ago. Despite the repeated calls by the Security Council and the General Assembly, it has persistently refused to withdraw from Lebanon and arrogantly remains in illegal occupation of the southern part of the country.

71. Having driven millions of Palestinians into exile from the land in which they and their forefathers had lived for countless generations, Israel now denies the most elementary human rights to those who are still living in the occupied territories and refuses to accord them the protection guaranteed under international law. These people are the victims of a ruthless policy of oppression and repression. In a systematic plan to alter the demographic character of the occupied territories and present the world with a *fait accompli*, the inhabitants of the occupied territories are arbitrarily being expelled from their lands in order to make way for Jewish settlements. As the events in Lebanon have shown, even Palestinians who live as refugees in other Arab countries are not spared. Israel's goal is no less than to destroy the national character of the Palestinian people and to erode their identification with their homeland.

72. The valiant struggle launched by the Palestinian people demonstrates, however, that Israel's policies, which have already produced so much bloodshed and bitterness, are bound to fail in their objective. Peace can return to the Middle East only if Israel abandons its expansionist designs and co-operates sincerely in the search of the international community for a just and lasting settlement. The Arab peace plan, adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[3] represented a constructive new initiative towards peace in the Middle East. Among the various other noteworthy initiatives towards a settlement of the Middle East problem are the Reagan plan of 1 September 1982[4] and the proposals made by the Soviet Union on 29 July of this year [*see A/39/368*].

73. The essential elements on which a Middle East peace could be based have been affirmed repeatedly by the General Assembly, by the Organization of the Islamic Conference and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. These elements include the following: the complete attainment by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights, including the right to return to their homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to establish their own State in Palestine; the right of the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing with the other parties in all efforts and negotiations on the Middle East; and Israel's withdrawal from all occupied territories, including Jerusalem.

74. Pakistan has consistently advocated these principles. Last year we supported General Assembly resolution 38/58 C on the proposed international peace conference on the Middle East in conformity with these principles and with the participation of all parties to the Arab-Israeli dispute, including the PLO. We therefore deeply regret that despite the highly commendable efforts made by the Secretary-General in connection with the holding of the conference, he has come to the conclusion that "the conditions required for convening the proposed conference with any chance of success are not met at the present time" [*A/39/600, para. 40*].

75. We agree with the Secretary-General that the United Nations has a special obligation to make another determined effort to find the means by which we can move forward to a negotiated peace in the Middle East. My delegation also supports the Secretary-General's intention to remain in close consultation with all the parties to the Middle East conflict in case he can play a useful role in the negotiating process. Equally, it is the responsibility of those countries which maintain close ties with Israel and extend military and economic assistance to it to use their influence to the full in order to persuade its Government to respond positively to the international call for a just, negotiated settlement in the Middle East. Failure to do so could drive the region into another tragic conflict.

76. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The complex of Middle East problems persistently eludes settlement. Although the Middle East has been the foremost concern of the United Nations for the past 37 years, all the basic problems still remain unsolved. The five wars that have been fought between Israel and the Arabs have not solved anything. On the contrary, they have created new problems and added new layers of complexity to the old ones. Furthermore, every war carries the seeds of the next one. The parable of this calamitous process should be clear both to the parties concerned and to the international community as a whole.

77. The key to the situation is and continues to be the Arab-Israeli conflict. We remain convinced that a comprehensive settlement of it must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The content of those resolutions is well known but still often forgotten: namely that Israel must withdraw from Arab territories occupied since 1967; the acquisition of territories by force is inadmissible; and the right of Israel and all other States of

the area to exist within secure and recognized boundaries must be guaranteed.

78. In addition to this, a provision must be made on behalf of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, including their right to national self-determination. This presupposes the right of the Palestinians to participate in negotiations on their own future within a comprehensive solution of the conflict. So far, attempts towards a comprehensive solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict have fallen before insurmountable obstacles. A major obstacle has been and remains the settlement policy of the Government of Israel in the territories occupied by it and its unilateral action to change the status of Jerusalem, a city of three great faiths. As the proposals and initiatives aimed at a comprehensive solution of the conflict have failed, frustration and despair in the occupied West Bank and Gaza have grown. Acts of violence, repeatedly occurring, have further aggravated the situation. This vicious cycle must be brought to a halt.

79. As we well know, violence in the Middle East has proved extremely prone to spread. Over the last years, the Government of Finland has followed the tragic events in Lebanon with growing concern. Lebanon became the victim of almost all the disputes and conflicts that have resulted from unresolved basic problems in the Middle East. We welcome the formation of the Government of National Unity. The national reconciliation, painfully achieved, must not fail. Tragic events have proved that a comprehensive and lasting solution of the problems in Lebanon requires the withdrawal of foreign forces and the restoration of Lebanese authority over the totality of its own territory inside internationally recognized borders.

80. My Government has noted with great satisfaction the beginning of the talks in Naqoura which will include a United Nations presence. We appeal to the parties not to let this chance for a negotiated solution go astray. We hope that the talks will lead to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, as well as to assured peace and security for all parties to the conflict, and that they will help to restore the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon in the area concerned.

81. The United Nations has an obligation to offer its services to the parties to the Middle East conflict and to support their efforts aimed at a comprehensive, just and lasting solution. We are still convinced that the United Nations and its peace-keeping operations will play a vital role in the search for a peaceful political solution of the problems.

82. In accordance with its policy of neutrality, Finland has taken a balanced and conciliatory position on the various controversial issues in the Middle East. We have maintained good relations with all the nations concerned, including the most immediate parties to the conflict. It is our firm intention to continue this policy, to preserve the confidence of all parties and thereby to be able to render appropriate peaceful services to the parties concerned. A tangible expression of our policy towards the Middle East is the sizeable contribution which Finland has made and continues to make to United Nations peace-keeping activities in the area.

83. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This morning we listened to a statement by the Israeli representative [*72nd meeting*]. He talked about all aspects of the Middle East question except the Palestinian and Arab-Israeli conflict as such.

84. That is nothing new to the General Assembly. We have listened many times to such statements by Israeli representatives in the General Assembly. What was new this time was the fact that the newly appointed Israeli representative tried to portray the Arab-Israeli conflict in terms of the Arab tradition of violence.

85. The implications of that theory for the analysis of the situation in the Middle East, with all its dangerous consequences with regard to the way of looking at the Arab-Israeli conflict, should be discussed in the General Assembly in a broader perspective. In the first place, talk about the Arab tradition of violence is racist talk. It is no wonder the Israeli representative talks in racist terms in analysing the situation in the Middle East. He intended to reach a certain conclusion, namely, that the Palestinian question is not the core of the conflict in the Middle East and that the problem is simply one of the Arab propensity to violence. This is a distortion of historical truth. Moreover, it is a distortion of the facts which reveals the racist spirit of the Israeli representative and provides the only prism through which to look at Israeli positions.

86. The Arab-Israeli conflict, which the General Assembly discusses at each session under the agenda item entitled "The situation in the Middle East", is one of the main causes of tension and war in the region and beyond. It is not surprising that the Middle East region has been a theatre of many wars and has not known the true meaning of peace since the establishment of the Zionist State on the land of Palestine. As in previous years, we are once again discussing this subject in the light of the following constant factors.

87. First, the international community represented by the General Assembly recognizes that the Palestinian problem is the core of the conflict in the Middle East and that without full recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return to their homeland and the right to self-determination, the explosive situation will remain a threat to peace and security.

88. Secondly, the international community recognizes that there can be no comprehensive and lasting solution in the Middle East without complete Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and the establishment by the Palestinian people of its own independent State in its national homeland, pursuant to General Assembly resolutions.

89. Thirdly, the General Assembly has welcomed and adopted the proposal to convene an international conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, on a footing of equality, since such a conference offers the best chance of settling the Arab-Israeli conflict as a whole and attaining a comprehensive and lasting peace.

90. This international consensus on the basis and best method for resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict within the framework of the United Nations continues to meet with opposition from Israel and the United States, whose negative positions can be summed up as follows.

91. In the first place, they refuse to recognize the existence of the Palestinian nation, instead considering the question of Palestine to be a problem of individuals or at best of refugees, not that of a people suffering from the scourges of imperialism, colonialism and repression, a people struggling for its right to self-determination, which is the right of all peoples in the world, and for its right to establish a State in Palestine.

92. Secondly, Israel refuses to withdraw from the Arab territories which it has been occupying by force and tries to achieve its aims by *faits accomplis*: Jewish colonization, the establishment of settlements, the deportation of Palestinians and the plundering of land and water resources. This negative attitude makes withdrawal difficult and complicated, if not impossible. In addition, that policy is accompanied by annexation, as in the case of the Golan Heights and the Holy City of Jerusalem.

93. Thirdly, the Israelis reject the idea of an international conference on peace in the Middle East as part of a consistent policy of excluding any active role by the United Nations, including the Security Council, in the peace process. They believe that the United States should be the sole intermediary in attempts to reach a peaceful solution to the problems of the region, as was the case at Camp David and with the unilateral solution resulting from that process, which paralysed Egypt's national will, froze Egypt's leading role and led Egypt into the sphere of influence of the United States.

94. It is against that background and those constants of the Israeli-American policy, which runs counter to the international consensus, that the General Assembly is once again discussing the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Assembly, as usual, will adopt resolutions and, as usual, Israel and the United States will oppose them, but this will not be the end of the story, for the policy of force, whatever may be its manifestations, cannot bestow upon Israel the right to colonize and to expand. Force breeds resistance, which becomes the only alternative to bowing to repression and *fait accompli*.

95. Although the outcome of our discussion at this session of the General Assembly will bring nothing new, yet the developments in the Middle East since the beginning of this year show unequivocally that the policy of force has reached its peak and that a new form of glorious popular resistance has emerged, dealing heavy blows to Israeli arrogance and, in turn, creating a counter *fait accompli*. What are these developments and what are the lessons that can be learned from them?

96. First, while the General Assembly was considering the situation in the Middle East last year, United States Marines were concentrated in the outskirts of Beirut, supported by the American fleet stationed in Lebanese territorial waters. American cannon and fighters were attacking the same Lebanese objectives that were being bombarded by Israel. It was obvious that the political co-ordination between the United States and Israel had developed into a type of military co-operation within the framework of the strategic agreement between them. But very soon the United States Administration realized that it had become involved in a battle in which it had no clear objective, except to follow the reckless Israeli policy in Lebanon. That Administration would not have withdrawn in such a disorganized state were it not for the heavy blows struck by the national resistance movement against the Israeli invasion forces and against those who came from across the ocean to protect the Israeli invasion.

97. After this bitter experience, American forces would hesitate before again getting involved in Israeli wars of expansion and aggression, although the United States continues to provide Israel with the latest weapons and ammunition.

98. Secondly, when the General Assembly was discussing the situation in the Middle East last year, Israel boasted that it had achieved its expansionist objectives in Lebanon, citing its agreement of 17 May—which followed the pattern of the Camp David agreements, in the sense that it was based on the same philosophy, that is, invasion first, negotiation afterwards under the aegis of the United States, so that the interests of both Israel and the United States might be served. But before the ink had dried on this agreement, which infringed upon Lebanese sovereignty and independence, it was abrogated under the heavy blows of the glorious Lebanese forces of resistance, to the extent that the Marines were withdrawn, and for the first time the Israeli forces swallowed their pride and had to yield to the counter forces, that being the only logic that Israel understands.

99. Thirdly, the abrogation of the 17 May agreement was not the last lesson Israel learned in Lebanon. It has learned that its wars with the Arabs cannot end by a cease-fire and negotiation from a position of force. Israel now realizes that the price of occupation in Lebanon is exorbitant. The presence of Israeli forces in southern Lebanon was the direct cause of a psychological and political crisis in Israeli society. It was also the reason for a serious economic crisis in Israel, in spite of American assistance, about which American citizens are beginning to complain. Thus, Israel, because of its occupation of southern Lebanon, faces three difficult choices, the worst one being the continuation of the occupation of southern Lebanon, which has become a graveyard of the Israeli invaders. As for the other two choices, both of them less disagreeable, one would be organized retreat and the other, retreat resembling flight, for the myth of the invincibility of the Israeli army and the superiority of the Israeli soldier was dissipated in southern Lebanon. The Israeli forces are now facing very strong resistance and are paying the price of aggression in spite of the sophisticated military technology available to it. Moreover, Israeli society has become divided because of the situation in southern Lebanon. As for the resistance, it continues to gain ground.

100. Fourthly, the chaos sown by Israel in southern Lebanon has also destroyed the myth of the superiority of the Israeli economic model. Because of the economic crisis in Israel, the representative of Israel had to go to Washington to ask for emergency assistance, and this happened because of the events in southern Lebanon. Thus, what will be the fate of this entity if Arab resistance is expanded? The resistance has opened new pages in the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict. American assistance to Israel will change nothing. Israel will remain an alien entity in the region, an entity that cannot resist the fighting Arab people.

101. The lessons to be drawn from this epic which is now unfolding in southern Lebanon will undoubt-

edly loom over our discussion of this item in the General Assembly. History is not static. If Israel and the United States continue to ignore these new developments and their profound significance and continue to defy the international community, no doubt the coming years will show them that the rules of the game have changed in the Middle East and that Israel has exhausted all its potentialities and sooner or later will have to give in to the new *fait accompli.*

102. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): Regrettably, this year again, as for so many years—too many years—in a row, the situation in the Middle East continues to be one of the most acute crises in the world. In the Middle East the most important principles of international relations are persistently and flagrantly violated. This is having negative and grave effects on the region and the world at large.

103. The denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, freedom and independence, and the policy of expansionism and aggression of Israel, are the root causes of this crisis.

104. Tensions have been increasing due to growing interference, military involvement and the presence and influence of non-regional interests and Powers. They do not care for the interests of the people living in the region but, rather, they are interested in strengthening their own positions in the global balance of power, thus making the crisis worse and its solution more remote.

105. The crisis in the Middle East is reaching beyond regional boundaries; it has become an integral part of developments from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean, and thus part and parcel of the overall international situation.

106. The non-aligned countries have been consistent in pointing to the urgency and importance of settling the Middle East crisis on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions. Since their first summit in Belgrade 23 years ago, they have considered that self-determination for the Palestinian people is at the core of the crisis and that any solution which does not respect the rights, dignity and the will of the Palestinian people will not bring about a just and lasting peace.

107. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, as well as the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October of this year, reconfirmed this view and emphasized the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force, as well as the inalienable right of the Palestinian people freely to decide its own destiny.

108. The developments in the Middle East are a telling example that one's own rights, freedom and independence cannot be realized, achieved or implemented by denial of and encroachment upon the same rights, the same freedom and the same independence of others. There are even attempts to portray the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people within the context of bloc rivalry. These attempts are intended only to conceal the essence of the Middle East crisis.

109. The Gaza Strip, the West Bank, Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights remain occupied by Israel. It is continuing its intensive illegal measures of annexation in defiance of international law, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Oppression and violation of fundamental human rights of the population in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, the policy of resettlement of the Palestinian and other Arab populations, and the constant expansion of illegal Israeli settlements have become daily practices of the occupying forces.

110. Terror and repression are the methods of occupying forces. Again, in the past few days, the Israeli armed forces have been sowing destruction and death among Palestinian youth in the occupied West Bank.

111. For more than three years, part of Lebanon—a sovereign, independent and non-aligned State—has been under Israeli occupation, and the Palestinian and Lebanese populations are still suffering.

112. Lebanon has found the strength to embark upon the road of national unity. The Government headed by Prime Minister Rachid Karamé should gain the support of the entire international community in its efforts to get Israel out of its national territory and to restore the full territorial integrity, sovereignty, independence and non-aligned status of Lebanon.

113. Withdrawal by Israel should be immediate and unconditional. In the Middle East, as anywhere else, so-called security interests and preventive strikes are not justified. Peace in any area cannot be built on the basis of occupation, annexation and the use of force.

114. The exercise of the sovereign will of the Palestinian people cannot be prevented. Neither should the demands of the United Nations for the urgent and unconditional withdrawal from the occupied territories be ignored. Dialogue on an equal footing between all parties directly involved, including the PLO, aimed at finding a just, comprehensive and lasting solution is indispensable. Developments, particularly the meeting of the Palestine National Council, have shown that attempts to eliminate the PLO as an independent and inevitable factor in the solution of the crisis are bound to fail.

115. However, the policy of force and imposition of foreign will continues. This is not and cannot be accepted either in the Middle East or anywhere else in the world.

116. Self-determination of all peoples is the paramount rule; hence, so is the self-determination of the Palestinian people. Hopes for justice and peace should not go unfulfilled and the policy of *fait accompli* should not be allowed to prevail. New efforts should be undertaken to counter any such policy and to achieve a solution on a comprehensive basis.

117. We feel it is the duty of the United Nations and of all States Members, particularly the members of the Security Council, to make renewed efforts in order to resolve the crisis.

118. Let me recall that at its last session the General Assembly, in resolution 38/58 C, endorsed the decision of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, proposing that an international peace conference on the Middle East be convened. An overwhelming majority of Member States have pronounced themselves in favour of such a confer-

ence in which all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict would be invited to participate, including the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

119. Time in the Middle East does not stand still. Everything should be done to bring about such a conference at the earliest possible date, and it is rightfully expected that all international protagonists will display stronger political will to that end.

120. The Secretary-General should receive every encouragement and support in carrying out his consultations for the convening of this conference.

121. The members of the Non-Aligned Committee of Eight on Palestine met at the ministerial level in New York on 3 October of this year and called for additional efforts to be undertaken in order to ensure the convening of such a peace conference under the aegis of the United Nations. They considered that the holding of an international conference, with the involvement of the Security Council, would help to achieve the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and lead to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region. The Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Committee on Palestine conveyed to Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, the full support of their Governments and peoples for the just struggle of the Palestinian people and for the PLO and its institutions.

122. The people of Yugoslavia have won and preserved their freedom and independence with enormous sacrifices. They have deep feelings of friendship for and solidarity with the Palestinian people in its just struggle for self-determination and national dignity. Non-aligned Yugoslavia has consistently supported, and will continue to do so, the solution of the Middle East crisis on the basis of respect for the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the policy of non-alignment. There can be no just, lasting and comprehensive solution without the implementation of and full respect for the principles of self-determination, sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, equality, non-interference and withdrawal of foreign troops from the occupied territories and the right of peoples to choose independently their own way of internal development. This implies the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, its sole and legitimate representative.

123. We firmly believe that a lasting solution can be built only on the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab and Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem; on the exercise of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national identity, sovereignty and the establishment of its own State; on the participation on an equal footing of the PLO, as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in all endeavours towards and negotiations on the peaceful settlement of the issue within the framework of the United Nations; and on ensuring life in peace and security for all countries and peoples in the Middle East and their independent social development within recognized boundaries, without the threat or use of force.

124. We feel, finally, that it is one of the primary responsibilities of the United Nations to strive to ensure the implementation of all decisions in this regard.

125. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): For the Middle East, 1984 has been so far a year of stalemate. Tensions have remained high, violence and suffering have continued, while peace efforts have not significantly advanced. The reason for this lies partly in the overall crisis of international relations and partly in developments within the region. Both sides sometimes appear to believe that time is their ally. Austria is convinced that this policy of "wait and see" rests on a dangerous illusion. Time does not work for anybody. On the contrary, with every additional day of confrontation the obstacles to peace tend to become greater and the prospects of negotiated settlements to diminish.

126. The initiation of a new vigorous peace process cannot wait any longer. Both sides are called upon to take steps to narrow the gap between their positions and to enter into a serious dialogue. Many ideas have been proposed for the substantive content of such a peace process. In spite of some differences, all these plans have a common core: the return of part of the former mandated territory of Palestine to the Palestinians in exchange for peace and security for all States of the region. This formula is as convincing as it is simple. But attempts to translate it into concrete policy have so far met with enormous political and psychological difficulties. To remove these obstacles created by decades of hate and fear is the greatest challenge to the present leadership of the countries of the Middle East.

127. Israel can choose to continue its policy of strength, military superiority and expansion and to persist in the occupation of foreign territories. Then it will have to continue to live in a state of war with its neighbours. Or, if Israel realizes that peace and the occupation of foreign territory cannot be reconciled, then peace will become possible. Certainly, reaching this goal will demand sacrifices, but what today might appear to Israel to be a sacrifice—such as recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to its own State—could ultimately turn out to be an investment in its own security and future.

128. It is, therefore, imperative that Israel withdraw from all territories occupied since 1967. Austria is deeply concerned about the present situation in these areas. The commitment to continued expansion of Israeli settlements, the expropriation of land, the displacement and harassment of the local population, not only violate international law but amount to a creeping annexation of these territories and thereby jeopardize the chances of a negotiated settlement. Members of the new Israeli Government have promised a change in the settlement policy. It is, in our view, an urgent necessity that this announcement be followed by concrete action. An immediate and complete halt to the settlement policy constitutes an indispensable first step to build the confidence needed for successful peace negotiations.

129. As we appeal to Israel to change its present course, we must also ask our Palestinian and Arab friends to undertake still greater efforts for the cause of peace. In spite of all the bloodshed and suffering of yesterday, they should establish with greater clarity that they recognize the State of Israel and its right to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. Both sides in the Middle East conflict have to come to

terms with each other's existence and legitimate interests. Both sides have to demonstrate their readiness for negotiations on a workable *modus vivendi*.

130. We know, of course, how difficult it is to overcome the hostility, mistrust and fear built up in many years of bitter history. But dialogue, respect for the rights of others and willingness for equitable compromise are the only way to stop the vicious cycle of violence and to make progress towards a just and lasting peaceful settlement.

131. Austria's position concerning the main elements of such a settlement has been consistent over the years. We reject policies based on military superiority and occupation of foreign territories. Any solution must be based on Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories, on recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to its own State, and on recognition of Israel's existence as a sovereign and independent State within secure and recognized borders. We recognize the PLO as the representative and spokesman of the Palestinian people and therefore believe that the PLO should be included in all efforts to find a just and peaceful solution.

132. Let me now turn to the situation in Lebanon, which continues to be in the foreground of international attention. The progress achieved by the Government of National Unity towards national reconciliation is, in our view, one of the few bright spots in the otherwise bleak picture presented by the Middle East today. Many difficult problems remain to be solved, however. Factional violence and terrorism threaten the process of stabilization. A decade of civil war and the Israeli invasion have left deep wounds in the social and economic fabric of Lebanon. Rebuilding a stable and prosperous Lebanon presents a formidable challenge.

133. To tackle these enormous problems successfully it appears essential that the foreign occupation of parts of Lebanon's territory be ended and that its full sovereignty and territorial integrity be restored. Israel must withdraw its troops from Lebanon without further delay. Austria welcomes the current efforts by the Secretary-General to facilitate an agreement on the Israeli withdrawal and the talks which have recently begun in Naqoura under the aegis of the United Nations. We believe that in the future the peace-keeping forces of UNIFIL will have an even greater role to play in securing peace and stability in southern Lebanon. The valuable work of the Secretary-General in Lebanon, the role of UNIFIL, UNDOF and UNTSO, and the important humanitarian activities of various United Nations organizations in the region are for us evidence that the United Nations has the potential and the responsibility to contribute substantively to the peace process in the Middle East. This conflict is, after all, one of the most dangerous crises in the world. Its implications transcend by far the confines of the region and constitute a direct threat to international peace and security.

134. Every country, regardless of its geographical distance from the Middle East, has a stake in the peaceful settlement of this crisis. As the only worldwide forum open to all parties to the conflict and to all other interested Powers, the United Nations presents unique opportunities for the search for a peaceful settlement. The efforts of the United Nations would, however, be insufficient without the active co-operation of all the parties concerned. Let us therefore all work together to bring about serious and realistic peace negotiations. Austria for its part stands ready to contribute to the best of its abilities to the advancement of the cause of peace in the Middle East.

135. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): For many years now, consideration of the particularly serious situation in the Middle East region has taken place only towards the end of the session, as if the General Assembly, confronted by the numerous challenges facing the nations of the world, preferred to devote its last resources to the consideration of a problem made all the more complex because the Assembly itself was directly involved in its creation.

136. This interminable crisis, fraught with suffering and tragic consequences and in which millions of human beings have been plunged for almost four decades, has its origins in an injustice unique in modern history, one which, because of the repercussions it has had on the relations which existed in the region, has radically changed the destiny of the peoples of this part of the world and seriously threatened international peace and security.

137. The injustice at the root of all the upheavals in the region is the plundering of a people's land, property and its rights with the approval of the United Nations, whose duty it is to safeguard already independent small nations and those emerging in the liberating struggle against occupying forces.

138. The injustice is also the creation on the Arab soil of Palestine, formerly a land of harmony and of the coexistence of peoples regardless of their race, their language and their religion, of a foreign entity professing the cult of force and the language of violence and hatred.

139. With the establishment of the Zionist entity, the region of the Middle East, the strategic importance of which, because of its position at the crossroads of three continents, was strengthened by the considerable resources of its subsoil, was immediately thrust into an era of turbulence and permanent crises marked by aggression, occupation and repression against the Arab peoples.

140. Irredentism, adventurism and expansionism constitute the essential features of the Zionist régime, which has been imposed upon a region where the different revealed religions could coexist in concord and harmony.

141. Israeli irredentism takes the form, first, of constant, obstinate rejection by the Zionist leaders of the international consensus on the question of Palestine. It is a triple negation in that it opposes recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, which have been accepted and regularly reaffirmed by the General Assembly; opposes the universally established representativeness of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people; and opposes any peace process in which the PLO would participate as a fully-fledged negotiator.

142. It also takes the form of a continuing occupation of the Arab territories conquered in 1967 and persistence in the policy of settlements at the expense of the dispossessed Arab owners, a policy that has been severely condemned by the Security Council and the General Assembly, which have declared it illegal, its purpose being to de-Arabize these territo-

ries and annex them definitively, in violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force.

143. Finally, it takes the form of the increasing repression of Arab peoples in the occupied territories, to which the Zionist military administration is resorting, repression which has been denounced each year by the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories and regularly condemned by the General Assembly for the past 15 years. This fierce repression of Palestinian civilians, which has assumed a new dimension with the blind terrorism practised by bands of fanatics, benefiting from the blessing of those in certain religious and political circles and enjoying impunity, is aimed at forcing the Arab populations, by acts of terror and threats, to seek exile, thereby swelling the ranks of the refugees.

144. This Israeli irredentism, the most recent demonstration of which has been the definitive rejection of the appeal of the international community for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East, is accompanied by adventurism and a frenzied expansionism, the numerous manifestations of which are seriously endangering peace and security in the region and throughout the world.

145. Thus the Zionist régime, deaf to the injunctions of the international community, has now been pursuing for several decades a policy of aggression, domination and intimidation against the Arab States of the region and systematically resorting to the use of force for the purpose of imposing its will upon the peoples of the Middle East.

146. The continued occupation of the Arab territories, the extension of Israeli legislation to the Syrian Golan Heights, the proclamation of Jerusalem as the "eternal capital of Israel", the aggression against the peaceful Iraqi nuclear installations, the threats against Syria and Jordan, the recent invasion of Lebanon and the occupation of the southern part of that country are part of that logic of violence and expansionism and are evidence of the warlike, expansionist nature of the Zionist régime.

147. In this respect, it is particularly worrying that the occupation of southern Lebanon is continuing and is being strengthened, that the Lebanese and Palestinian populations continue to endure the Calvary of oppression and occupation and that the resolutions of the Security Council calling for the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanese territory have so far not been implemented.

148. In fact, the Zionist régime, which has always defied the will of the international community and the resolutions of the United Nations, far from committing itself to withdrawal, is increasing its manoeuvres and obstacles to delay the disengagement of its troops and is tightening its grip on southern Lebanon and the civilian populations.

149. By identifying the Palestinian national fact as the Gordian knot of the Middle East problem and the key to any settlement of that problem, the General Assembly recognized 10 years ago that all the manifestations of the crisis that had until then monopolized its attention were nothing more than marginal phenomena used in attempts to divert its attention from the heart of the problem: the usurpation of the land of the Palestinian people and the denial of that people's national rights. With this historic leap, the Assembly decided to rise to the level of its responsibilities and resolutely to embark on the search for a comprehensive solution, because that is the only possible solution to the interminable Middle East conflict.

150. The General Assembly defined the elements of that settlement and has reiterated them with remarkable consistency throughout regular and special sessions. They consist of the fulfilment of the following dual requirement: the restoration to the Palestinian people of all its inalienable national rights, including the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent State in Palestine; and the total, unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories.

151. The means for bringing about such a settlement were spelt out by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, which endorsed the call for convening an international peace conference on the Middle East, as recommended by the 1983 International Conference on the Question of Palestine.

152. The elements and institutional framework for a comprehensive settlement having been decided on by the General Assembly, all efforts should be made today for the convening of that conference, in which the PLO must participate fully, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. This is an opportunity that the Arab States of the region have declared themselves ready to accept, as the surest way to end the bloody conflict that has engulfed the Middle East and to ensure that peace and justice may return to that part of the world.

153. Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset, I should like to express the thanks of my delegation to the Secretary-General for his report on the various aspects of the situation in the Middle East [*A/39/600*]. The report shows in general that no progress has been made towards settling the question and that the situation has deteriorated, threatening peace and security in the region and beyond.

154. That is why we are once again considering this item, entitled "The situation in the Middle East". The situation that we are discussing today is not that which prevailed many years ago, when the item was first inscribed on the General Assembly's agenda, in 1967. Since then, the situation has deteriorated. We used to consider specific matters, but now such matters have multiplied, leading to the creation of new sets of ever more complicated issues. The result is that the Middle East has become a region of constant tension, anxiety and threats to international peace and security.

155. A quick glance at the developments in the region over the past year shows that the situation has deteriorated in all fields and that the international community, represented by the United Nations, has not been able to stop that deterioration, in spite of the numerous resolutions adopted by the Organization. Moreover, all the efforts to reach a peaceful settlement have failed to achieve any progress because, on the one hand, of a lack of understanding of the real reasons behind the conflict in the region, and, on the other hand, because of the unidimensional approach that characterized political movements in the region, especially the attempts at exclusiveness and unilateralism, which in our view cannot offer a

good basis for a just solution capable of taking account of the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples suffering under the yoke of occupation, injustice and hatred.

156. Therefore, my country supported General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, concerning the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. We still believe that that conference offers the required framework within which to reach a peaceful and just solution, provided the main conditions that gave rise to the problem in the first place are eliminated.

157. Two factors should be mentioned when we are talking about the Middle East. First, Israeli leaders are bent on achieving the objectives of the Zionist movement by establishing what is called Greater Israel, so that Israel can become the greatest military Power in the region. This would be achieved by seizing the remaining parts of the land of Palestine and controlling, through invasion, occupation and annexation, the largest possible area of neighbouring Arab countries, with a view to dominating the region, controlling its economic, social and political orientation and frustrating economic and social development in order to impose backwardness on the region, so that it remained simply a market for consumption.

158. Secondly, some States try to exploit the objectives of the Zionist movement, as represented by Israel, in order to achieve their own economic ambitions in the region and strengthen their strategic presence through Israel's military might. A glance at the history of international relations in the region since the establishment of Israel shows that the Western countries have taken turns in maintaining Israel's military superiority, so much so that military and economic assistance to Israel represents an important part of the budgets of some States and constitutes a basic commitment for them.

159. The strategic co-operation agreements between the United States and Israel have added a new dimension to the conflict in the region. They confirm the validity of the theory I have just advanced and encourage Israel to reject, to disregard and even to take lightly all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations. Thus, we denounce those agreements because we see in them American support for the Israeli policy of continued aggression against the Arab States and encouragement to the Israeli authorities to continue their repression of the Palestinian people aimed at eliminating them.

160. These are the major factors that are continuing to contribute to the complexity of the situation in the Middle East. We believe that the flow of military, economic and financial aid to Israel is the major factor which enables Israel to persist in its aggression. We also believe that unless General Assembly resolution 38/180 A, which calls, *inter alia*, on all States to suspend economic, military and financial assistance to, and all co-operation with, Israel is implemented, no tangible progress in settling the problem will be possible.

161. Such is the general context of the problem of the Middle East. If we turn to the direct aspects of this problem, I would say that the main one is the Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people which led, in 1947 and 1948, to the swallowing of the greater part of the Palestinian lands and the forcing of the people of those regions to leave their homes. This was followed by the gradual usurpation of the remaining Palestinian lands, through aggression, war and the escalation of repression and terror, the aim being to compel the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza to leave those areas. Then Israel frustrated the Palestinian people, psychologically, suppressing their resistance to occupation, stifling their struggle to restore their national rights and pursuing them wherever they were.

162. The second aspect of the Middle East problem is the Israeli aggression against our sister Arab State, Syria. That aggression has a clear objective: the occupation and annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights. As in the case of occupied Palestine, Israel has started to expel the citizens of that area through a series of arbitrary measures and, lately, the enactment of laws aimed at annexation of the region, including the imposition of Israeli nationality on Syrian citizens.

163. The third aspect of the problem is the Israeli aggression against Lebanon. That aggression has uncovered the true face of Israel and its desire to dominate and expand. The world at large has seen the tragic consequences of that aggression, which have included collective massacres, the intervention of foreign troops, the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, the destruction of the Lebanese economy, the deportation of the population of the south and Israel's refusal to withdraw from southern Lebanon. Moreover, Israel links such withdrawal to a number of conditions which show an attempt to diminish Lebanon's sovereignty and to continue Israeli occupation and domination, directly or indirectly, of some Lebanese territories. In this regard, I should like to pay tribute to the heroic resistance of the fraternal Lebanese people against the forces of occupation. That resistance played a major role in compelling Israel to reconsider its plans of permanent occupation of southern Lebanon.

164. The fourth aspect of this problem is the Israeli aggression against the Arab States, which Ariel Sharon, the former Minister of Defence of Israel, called Israel's role of policeman from the Atlantic Ocean to Pakistan. An example of such Israeli aggression is Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear research facility. Here one can see the dimensions of the policeman role of which Sharon spoke. Another aspect emphasizing the objectives for which Israel was created is its practice of attacking any facility which Israel or its allies believe could constitute an important economic base in the region; thus, Israel is kept as a sword against the peoples of the region who are maintained as hostages to foreign interests and strategic plans.

165. The General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted many resolutions condemning these aspects, aggressions and practices and requesting Israel to put an end to them. Moreover, many resolutions have been adopted which recognize the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, including the right to return to its country, the right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent State in its own homeland.

166. In addition, the Security Council has adopted two famous resolutions, resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory.

167. All these resolutions, which concern the four main aspects of the problem of the Middle East,

reflect two important facts. First, the international community categorically rejects the Israeli explanations by which it attempts to justify with legal arguments or by reasons of security its policies and practices against the Palestinian people and the Arab States. Secondly, the international community has categorically declared illegal all those policies and practices because they contravene the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law; but the reaction of Israel has been to refuse to comply with these resolutions. Israel is thus violating its commitment under Article 25 of the Charter which states: "The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

168. No other State, in the history of the United Nations, has been condemned by so many resolutions as has Israel. All those resolutions denounce Israeli practices and call for an end to them. We all know the fate of those resolutions. My delegation therefore believes that no resolution regarding Israel will be effective unless it can be backed by the possibility of actual application.

169. The Charter has outlined the methods to be adopted in case of acts of aggression in contravention of the principles of the Charter and of international law. The first method is the application of Chapter VII of the Charter with regard to any State that commits breaches of the peace or acts of aggression. This method is governed by Articles 39 to 42 of the Charter. In the light of the repeated Israeli acts of aggression against the Arab States and against the people of Palestine, and in view of its continued threat to peace and security, not only in our region but in the world as a whole—acts that have been condemned by the United Nations in numerous resolutions—we believe that all those Articles are applicable in the case of Israel.

170. The second method is expulsion from the Organization under Article 6 of the Charter, which states:

> "A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

We believe that that Article applies categorically to the case of Israel.

171. The application to Israel of these two provisions is clear from the text and spirit of the Charter. Actually, that is the only way to compel Israel to end its aggression, annexation and defiance. Unless we do so we shall come back next year again to discuss the causes of the problem and its consequences—in other words, we shall be moving in a vicious circle. My delegation hopes that we shall be able to break this vicious circle and that everyone will understand the dangers which are threatening the region. We also hope that the States that have special responsibility for international peace will undertake their proper role and assume their responsibilities.

172. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia): The United Nations has been dealing with the situation in the Middle East for a number of years. Unfortunately, in spite of dozens of resolutions and decisions that have been adopted, the tensions in that region not only have remained unabated but have, on the contrary, been escalated even further. The chronically explosive situation threatens to grow into a war conflict. The responsibility for such developments must be fully borne by the United States and by Israel, which acts as its long arm in its efforts to gain domination over the Middle East. Being interested both in the strategic position of the region, which is advantageous in its plans for world hegemony, and in the region's large resources of raw materials, primarily oil, the United States is striving by every means to gain a decisive influence in that part of the world.

173. It is the United States that must accept the blame for the fact that the Middle East is probably the only region that has had no peace since the end of the Second World War almost 40 years ago. Time and again, that region has experienced escalating conflicts and clashes growing into large-scale wars. Tens of thousands of soldiers have lost their lives there, and the toll has been even heavier among civilians. The Israeli aggression alone has taken the lives of hundreds of thousands of people in the Arab countries.

174. The imperialist interests of the United States in the Middle East are promoted by the expansionist policies of Israel, with which the United States has concluded a strategic alliance. Aware of the full support of the United States, Israel has been continuing, in disregard of the condemnation of the whole international community, to occupy extensive areas in southern Lebanon, the west bank of the River Jordan, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and the eastern part of Jerusalem, establishing in the occupied territories more and more militarized settlements and escalating terror against the Arab population.

175. The history of Israel is one of a continuous series of acts of aggression against the neighbouring countries. We have vivid memories of the last one, directed against Lebanon and posing a threat to the very existence of that country as an independent State. That aggression was characterized by unprecedented brutality and brought new suffering to millions of Arabs.

176. The full support rendered to Israel during its aggression against Lebanon by the United States has plainly revealed to the whole world the strategic alliance of the two countries directed against the people of the Arab countries. The infamous role played in Lebanon by United States troops under the guise of United States participation in the so-called multinational forces entrusted with "ensuring security" is well known. Having carried out a direct military intervention against the Lebanese patriotic forces and the inter-Arab peace-keeping units, the United States has stepped onto the same platform as the Israeli aggressor. United States warships fired thousands of tons of grenades on Lebanese villages and towns, killing many civilians.

177. Although it was forced to withdraw its contingents from Lebanon, the United States has not given up consideration of the possibility of direct military engagement in the Middle East, using all available opportunities to attempt to resurrect the so-called multinational forces, as, for instance, in the so-called assistance in removing mines from maritime routes in the Red Sea.

178. While doing all this, the United States wishes to pass itself off as a peacemaker. However, its so-called peace initiatives are in fact quite unequivocally aimed at furthering the ambitions of the Israeli

aggressor, in total disregard of the legitimate interests of the Arab people. The United States is imposing upon countries of the Middle East inequitable separate agreements with Israel; it refuses to recognize the right of the PLO, the only legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, to represent the Palestinian people in international forums; it creates obstructions to the convening of an international conference on the Middle East which might find a comprehensive settlement with regard to all aspects of the situation in the region. The complete failure of the attempts by the United States to bring about a separate settlement in Lebanon provides proof that the Palestinian and Arab peoples realize the purpose of United States engagement in the Middle East.

179. In spite of those dangerous elements, a way out of the crisis exists, but it cannot be sought in separate agreements imposed on Arab States by Israel and the United States. Pointing out this fact, the countries of the socialist community have more than once warned against such a solution. History has confirmed that their concern is justified.

180. Czechoslovakia resolutely condemns the aggressive policy pursued by the United States and Israel in the Middle East region. We consider it necessary that the Middle East crisis be solved in a just manner that provides for the peace and security of all nations in the region.

181. Czechoslovak foreign policy towards the Arab States is consistently based on the principle of active support for their just cause and for all steps aimed at strengthening their unity of action in their struggle against aggression, imperialism and zionism. Traditional friendship and mutually beneficial co-operation are characteristic features of our relations with this politically and economically important region.

182. The Czechoslovak Prime Minister, Lubomir Štrougal, said last June during his visit to the Syrian Arab Republic:

> "We share your conviction that a just and lasting peace will be established in the Middle East too. It will happen when the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the right to self-determination and its own independent State, are exercised; when the last Israeli occupier leaves Arab territories; when United States warships disappear over the horizon from the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea."

183. We consider that a good basis for a universal and just solution of the Middle East conflict has been provided in the Soviet proposals of 29 July of this year [*A/39/368*]. The six principles underlying them are based on generally recognized norms of international law and documents of the United Nations. They include, primarily, the principle of the inadmissibility of conquering foreign territories by means of aggression; the principle of recognition of the right of the Palestinian people, with the PLO as its sole representative, to self-determination and to establish its own independent State on Palestinian territory, free from Israeli occupation; the principle of assuring in practice the right of all States in the region to security, independent existence and development; the principle of terminating the state of war and establishing peace between the Arab States and Israel; and, finally, the principle of providing effective international guarantees.

184. However, Israel and the United States, despite their pompous words about peace, reject those realistic proposals. The reason is obvious: the two strategic allies are not willing even to consider the return of the territories occupied by Israel and the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. They reject also the idea of an international conference because of the fact that, in separate negotiations with individual Arab States, Israel, backed by United States support, undoubtedly has the upper hand. But the main reason for their refusal is that Israel and the United States think that, in the given circumstances, they are able to dictate to the peoples of the Middle East, through rough military force, the settlement that they consider most advantageous to themselves.

185. Yet the road to peace is different; it is the road of respect for the fundamental norms of international law and the decisions of the United Nations and of negotiations on a comprehensive solution of the problem with the participation of all parties concerned. We are convinced that it is possible to achieve in the Middle East a true, lasting and just peace. A substantial contribution thereto must also be made by the United Nations and all its Members, including the United States and Israel. Only when these prerequisites are fulfilled can a just settlement be brought about to this long-standing, dangerous conflict, the termination of which is in the interest of all nations in the Middle East. Moreover, the elimination of that hotbed of tension would also have a positive impact on the overall international situation.

186. Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): The irony was pointed out earlier that the region of the Middle East, the birthplace of three great religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—continues tragically to be denied peace and tranquillity. Turmoil and unrest in the Middle East have, at the very least, a history as long as that of the United Nations.

187. While the long agony of the people of the Middle East has been dramatized in gruesome atrocities such as those of Sabra and Shatila, the implications of this tragedy are such that its repercussions extend far beyond the region. Each upheaval, each act of violence, sends shock waves throughout the world, posing a threat to international peace and security.

188. The situation in the Middle East is a complex one, involving many interrelated issues, many conflicts and the clash of many interests. Certainly the question of the Middle East cannot be over-simplified. Each crisis, however sudden it may seem, has causes that extend into the past and, equally, consequences that reach out into the future. It is possible, nevertheless, to unravel certain strands in this complex question and to isolate and identify the major obstacles to the establishment of conditions of peace and security in the Middle East.

189. At the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, it was clearly reaffirmed that: "The question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East problem and the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict."[5] It is clear that no settlement of the Middle East problem is possible without the solution of the question of Palestine. Although the situation is of great complexity, the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the continuing unrest in the Middle East is the delay in settling the question of Palestine. The late historian Arnold Toynbee maintained that the Middle East would not be at peace until there was a just settlement of the question of Palestine.

190. My delegation holds the view that a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East must fulfil the following fundamental conditions: the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territory, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and the recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Those rights include their right to return to their homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent State in Palestine. Those basic elements for a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East question are common to a number of blueprints for peace in the region, although there are admittedly differences in emphasis and varying nuances reflecting individual perceptions. The proposals of the non-aligned States, the Arab States, particularly at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez in September 1982,[3] the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, and others have all asserted those principles as constituting the broad essentials for a settlement.

191. Despite the near-universal acceptance of those principles, the approaches and methods for their fulfilment have been as numerous as the issues have been complicated. There are questions of timing, questions relating to pre-conditions and guarantees, questions relating to the sequence and pace of implementation and the question of who should participate and with what status. Sri Lanka believes strongly that the people of Palestine, represented by the PLO, should enjoy full-party status on an equal footing in any negotiations aimed at a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East issue. The uniquely representative character of the PLO has been accepted by the overwhelming majority of the international community. Indeed, a number of countries, including my own, have accorded full diplomatic status to the PLO.

192. The situation in the occupied territories, covered in section III of the Secretary-General's report [*A/39/600*], is one which is highly volatile. We are of the view that the illegal Israeli settlements in the occupied territories must be dismantled and that any action aimed at changing the legal status, geographic nature, institutional structures or demographic composition of those territories is null and void. Other aspects of the human rights situation have been considered in some depth in the examination of the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, of which Sri Lanka is a member.

193. Another dimension to the Middle East question is posed by the sad developments in Lebanon. We deplore the terrible loss of life and destruction caused by continuing hostilities in Lebanon and call for strict respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon throughout the entirety of its internationally recognized boundaries, free from any form of foreign interference or pressure.

194. The United Nations involvement in peace-keeping operations in the Middle East, including Lebanon, is laudable, and Sri Lanka fully supports them. However, they are clearly only interim arrangements which should in no way console us as a substitute for a more viable and comprehensive settlement.

195. Similarly, while United Nations efforts through UNRWA, despite its limited resources, towards alleviating the plight of Palestinian refugees have been deserving of the support of all, the situation of the refugees continues to be a matter of grave lingering concern. The question of Palestine is not a question of refugees, but a question affecting the inalienable rights of an entire people, of an entire nation.

196. The list of speakers on this item is long, and Sri Lanka has added its own voice in the hope of serving to emphasize those essential features in the Middle East situation which need to be identified. The Secretary-General has pointed out that none of the parties to this tragic conflict could hope to obtain its maximum demands. Equally, a settlement will not be lasting unless all the complexities are taken into account. In this sense, the United Nations offers the best forum in which the totality of the Middle East question can be comprehensively considered. We do not minimize bilateral or multilateral initiatives for peace as long as they take full account of the roots of the problem, are just and are based on universally accepted principles relating to the Middle East to which I have just referred.

197. The use of force and unilateral action can only aggravate the situation further, devalue the role of the United Nations and limit the prospects for international and lasting acceptance of any arrangement. In this context, it is only the United Nations which can embrace all the dimensions to the Middle East question. Sri Lanka hopes that the United Nations, including the Security Council, will play a more central and decisive role in implementing the international consensus that has evolved as constituting the essential element for a just and lasting settlement.

198. The Secretary-General has had discussions on the possibility of using the machinery of the Security Council in a manner which could help to distill the common elements in the numerous proposals on the Middle East in order to work out a satisfactory negotiating structure. We trust that those endeavours will bear fruit and lead to a concerted international effort to settle the question of the Middle East.

199. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I wish first of all to express the thanks and appreciation of the delegation of Lebanon to the Secretary-General for his report [*ibid.*].

200. The Secretary-General's interest in the region, his striving to bring about an end to the crisis there and his concern for the reputation and credibility of the United Nations are all factors that increase the peoples' faith in this international Organization and in the role played by its Secretariat.

201. The frankness with which the Secretary-General has dealt in the report with all the issues stems from a sincere wish to make a constructive contribution to resolving the problem. The obstacles, the difficulties and the fear of the prolongation of the "no peace, no war" state, the concerns and warnings of danger, and the waning hope of being able to reach a solution to the Middle East crisis—all are dealt with in the report with courage, clarity and pragmatism.

202. It is on this basis that the delegation of Lebanon is today considering this item with its well-

known seriousness, conscious of its responsibility and confident in the role and responsibility of the United Nations in this question that affects the future of peoples and the economic, social and political future of our civilized world.

203. Lebanon's votes in favour of the lawful interests of peoples, their right to independence and self-determination, and particularly the cause of the Middle East and Palestine stems from its belief in the right of the Palestinian people to enjoy its full inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination, the right to return to its homeland, Palestine, and to establish its own independent State.

204. Lebanon welcomes any political initiative aimed at finding a just and durable solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Lebanon has supported the Secretary-General's call for an international conference on peace in the Middle East. Lebanon is prepared to contribute to efforts to ensure the success of such a conference, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/58 C.

205. While the Secretary-General expresses in his report doubts about the possibility of holding such a conference because the necessary conditions do not exist at the moment, Lebanon believes that its problem should be considered separately from the situation in the Middle East, because the latter issue is urgent and critical and its effects are dangerous and threaten the economic and social infrastructure of the region.

206. In his address on 5 October to the General Assembly [*22nd meeting*], Mr. Rachid Karamé, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Lebanese Republic, set out the aims and policies of the Lebanese Government, placing them under three basic headings: security, liberation and reconstruction. I do not want to go back to that statement in detail, but I must pause here to consider the progress and all the positive results which have been achieved under those three headings since 5 October last.

207. First, as far as security is concerned, following the implementation of the first stage of the security plan for greater Beirut and after the authorities had taken over control of the ports, the Government decided to undertake the second phase of the plan pertaining to the deployment of the Lebanese army along the coast of the capital, Beirut, south to the Awali River, where the Israeli occupation forces are still entrenched, and north to Tripoli.

208. In addition, the Government has deployed three brigades of the army to ensure the security of the south, the western Bekaa and Rashaya and the population of those areas as soon as Israel withdraws therefrom. The Lebanese army alone will maintain the security of the land and the dignity of its inhabitants. We do not recognize any other army working outside the framework of our legitimate army.

209. Secondly, as regards liberation, which we consider to include the liberation of the land and of its people, Lebanon, on 12 October of this year, called on the Secretary-General to exert his efforts and good offices to ensure the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops and the setting up of security arrangements to protect Lebanon's southern borders. As the Assembly is aware, following consultations and compacts, the Secretary-General, on 31 October, called for meetings at the military level at Naqoura, the headquarters of UNIFIL, for that purpose. To date, six meetings have been held under United Nations auspices, represented by UNIFIL and within the framework of the truce agreement signed between Lebanon and Israel in 1949.

210. We have great hopes that the work of these meetings will be crowned with success and that they will be followed by complete Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon, western Bekaa and Rashaya, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

211. The entire international community and the Member States represented in the Security Council—in particular the permanent members—must support the efforts of the Secretary-General and induce Israel to withdraw. They must support the legitimacy of the Lebanese authorities so that the inhabitants of the region may live in peace and security.

212. Liberation must be achieved, and meanwhile Israel must cease its practices in the occupied territories. These have been the subject of a number of complaints put forward by Lebanon and distributed as official documents of the General Assembly and the Security Council. These complaints have been considered by the permanent members of the Security Council and their Governments at the appropriate time. Furthermore, representatives have heard all the statements made in the General Assembly and the Security Council dealing with these practices in detail, as well as our call for the cessation of such practices. The sufferings of our peoples in these regions are economic, material, physical and moral and contravene even the most fundamental human rights and the most fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the Geneva conventions, particularly the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[1]

213. What Lebanon is demanding is its right as an independent State to live in peace and security. This is a natural right that was enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations when Lebanon became one of its founding Members. It is a right that has been reaffirmed in many resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. To condone the aggressive acts of a Member State, to procrastinate regarding implementation of the relevant resolutions, is to endanger the survival of the United Nations and lessens people's faith in it and in its ability to deter the aggressor. The Secretary-General, in paragraph 37 of his report [*A/39/600*], points out the adverse effects of the stalemate in the Middle East on the authority and status of the United Nations itself.

214. With the continuing Israeli occupation, it was inevitable that Lebanese national resistance should intensify. This purely Lebanese resistance, which is very dear to us, is the best indicator of the courage of the people in the Israeli occupied territories; of their dignity and their determination to rid themselves of the occupation and to return to the mother nation.

215. The presence in southern Lebanon of international forces represents for us international recognition of Lebanese legitimacy. It represents an international commitment to return the region to Lebanese sovereignty.

216. Today, for the first time, United Nations forces are playing an effective role, thanks to the good offices of the Secretary-General and his assistants. For that reason, we strongly demand not only

that those forces remain but also that they be enabled to carry out the task initially entrusted to them. They must be enabled to ensure complete Israeli withdrawal and assist the legitimate authorities to regain control of all Lebanese territories within the internationally recognized borders. None of this will be possible unless the effectiveness of these forces is increased, the scope of their task is widened and their numbers are increased, so that they can participate with the legitimate Lebanese army, for a specific period, in re-establishing peace and security in southern Lebanon.

217. We must point out that the international forces, despite their limited potential and numbers, have made many sacrifices. They have been subjected to much harassment and have had to bear the excesses of the occupying authorities. However, they have remained at their post and done their job. We therefore extend the thanks and appreciation of Lebanon to the leaders of those forces, in particular General Callaghan, and to the officers, soldiers and administrators, as well as to all the participating States.

218. Thirdly, as far as reconstruction and development are concerned, the 10 years of crisis and the Israeli incursion of 1982, which reached the capital, Beirut, caused economic destruction in both the private and the public sector, seriously endangering the infrastructures set up by the Lebanese. In order to reconstruct those vital infrastructures, Lebanon requires assistance from the United Nations and the specialized agencies, as well as from all industrialized and oil-exporting States. The expenses of this reconstruction are proving astronomical and exceed the initial estimates made by the council for reconstruction in Lebanon, by more than 20 billion. The specialized agencies have elaborated several projects, some of which we are now beginning to carry out in accordance with our priorities and the financial resources available. This reconstruction will require a huge financial and humanitarian effort over a period of many years and is far beyond the limited capacity of Lebanon.

219. The determination of Lebanon and its people to survive and to return to normal life by ending the occupation and ensuring peace and security through reconstruction must be complemented by determination on the part of the United Nations to assist us in achieving these ends. Agreement by States, and particularly the two super-Powers, on a clear and honest policy that would put an end to the tragedy of Lebanon would benefit Lebanon and its cause, the Middle East and the world as a whole. Disagreement makes it impossible to resolve crises; it simply raises more problems to add to the many unsolved ones that threaten international peace and security.

220. I had intended to end my substantive statement here. However, the representative of Israel, in his statement this morning [*72nd meeting*], mentioned two issues on which I cannot possibly remain silent. First, there was his use of the word "dependent" or "satellite" in describing Lebanon's foreign relations. I wish to assure him that Lebanon is not and will never be anyone's satellite. I wish he had not used such a description, because it is not in Israel's interest, since it raises the following question: to which country does such a description really apply? Secondly, he said that 100,000 people had been killed in Lebanon. Indeed, this figure could be true. However, it is equally true that his country's contribution to that high death toll has been considerable. This is something that I hope he will not [illegible] as is his well-known custom.

221. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam): Lebanon used to be a beautiful and prosperous country in the Middle East. Israel's invasion in June 1982 turned it into a battered country of much suffering. Under the pretext of safeguarding its security, Israel invaded and occupied the southern part of Lebanon and under the same pretext its artillery and air force pummelled Beirut. Its ground forces then pounded the way into the city, razing part of it to the ground. In the wake of this invasion, hundreds of Palestinian refugees were massacred in Sabra and Shatila. A peace treaty was forced upon the then Lebanese Government, obviously in the aggressor's favour. As if that were not enough, thousands of United States Marines landed on the soil of that country to help secure the implementation of that treaty and also the annihilation of the Palestinian forces there.

222. Although at present the explosive tension seems to have lessened, thanks to sustained efforts on the part of the Lebanese Government, a serious danger of a flare-up remains a constant source of grave concern. The withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces from Lebanon has become the talk of the town. Yet it has left much to be desired. Lebanon in fact demonstrates in miniature what has been happening in the Middle East for the last four decades, with the question of Palestine at the centre.

223. The founding of Israel in 1948 was the result of decade-long cruel intrigues, manipulations and calculation by several Western Powers. Its birth, unfortunately, went hand in hand with the denial of statehood to the Palestinians, thereby turning them into global nomads. Violence was the midwife of zionism, which is synonymous with aggression, expansion, terrorism and massacre. The realities of the past 36 years have testified to the fact that Israel, in blindly following its Zionist ambitions, has become a permanent factor of instability, a source of constant threat to the sovereignty and independence of the Palestinian and Arab peoples, to territorial integrity, and to peace and security in the region.

224. In the course of five wars of aggression against its neighbouring countries, Israel has experimented with all types of warfare, from "the whole nation as a front" and "carrying war into the enemy's land", to "superiority of weapons" and "winning a super-Power's sympathy". The ultimate goal remains the same for successive Zionist administrations—that is, to carry out aggression and the annexation of territory in the realization of their ambition for Greater Israel. It has therefore assumed the position of an exclusionist, expansionist and militarist State. It has cultivated an aggressive style, to which it has become addicted and by which it has won the sympathy of the super-Power it always has in mind. The land of Palestine, Jerusalem, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Syrian Golan Heights and the southern part of Lebanon are certainly not enough to satisfy the Zionist thirst.

225. In parallel with its policy of territorial annexation, Israel has pursued an extremely inhumane policy and savage practices against the people in its occupied areas, in flagrant defiance of the whole network of human rights. These policies and practices include the imposition of its laws and regulations, daily arrests, imprisonment, terror and massa-

cre, making life so unbearable for the indigenous people that they have to leave their homes. The Arab countries have repeatedly denounced before the world the massacres on the model of those at Sabra and Shatila and the genocide carried out by Israel against their people.

226. Although Israel is very aggressive and ambitious, we know for sure that it would not dare to act so flagrantly, in total disregard of international law and public opinion, if it stood alone, without the enormous military and financial assistance, political protection and encouragement it receives from the United States. The United States is believed to have measured its policy pertaining to the Middle East by a yardstick fashioned in Israel, for the latter is its most important ally in the region. They have so much in common. The colonialist, expansionist policy of one serves so effectively the reactionary global strategy of the other. President Reagan once said: "The fall of the Shah of Iran has increased Israel's value as perhaps the only remaining strategic asset in the region on which the United States can truly rely."

227. The annual flow of approximately $4 billion from the United States has enabled Israel to feed its giant war machine with nuclear capability and finance its expansionist and annexationist drive. The United States provides Israel with political protection, to the extent of closing its eyes to reality, using its power of veto even in issues of a humanitarian nature, as in the case of Lebanon's draft resolution submitted to the Security Council on 6 September 1984.[6] We, therefore, are never taken in by its verbal protests at Israel's acts. In fact, the United States has turned Israel into a regional gendarme, as an instrument to carry out for it the policy of State terrorism.

228. Another aspect worth mentioning is the United States attempt to weaken the unity of the Arab community through peace negotiations between Israel and individual Arab States. The Camp David accords and the May peace treaty are vivid examples of the so-called step-by-step diplomacy.

229. While some Western countries have learned their lessons and pulled themselves out of the Middle East quicksand, the failure in and withdrawal from Lebanon are not enough of a lesson for the United States. Its forces still patrol around and it tries to seize every opportunity to maintain its military presence and flex its muscles in that part of the world. In this case, the English proverb should be paraphrased to read: "The road to hell is paved with sordid intentions."

230. Even with the whole-hearted support of the United States, Israel still faces many difficulties owing to its acts of aggression and expansion. Internally, it is in hot water. Stagnation and inflation, the erosion of its people's confidence and a profound Government crisis prevail. Externally, it has been denounced and condemned by the whole world. In order to overcome these difficulties and break out of its isolation, Israel is now looking for birds of its own feather. Its collusion with the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is notorious. It has already forged relationships with some Fascist and reactionary régimes in Latin and Central America. Now the Asian expansionist and hegemonist Power has come along. As reported by the English magazine *Jane's Defence Weekly,* in its 20 November issue, this Power has maintained its secret ties with Israel, and they have recently signed a major contract for $3 billion worth of weapons. How ironic it is that this Power continues to preach about the just cause of the Palestinian and Arab peoples and its unswerving support for liberation movements throughout the world.

231. Israel's atrocities and its macabre alliance with the United States and other international reactionaries may cause serious difficulties to the Palestinian and Arab people, but it can in no way prevent them from continuing their struggle for national salvation and defence. The Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative, and with the effective support of the entire Arab and international communities, are now persistently striving towards the establishment of their own State in Palestine. The delegation of Viet Nam once again reaffirms its full support for the Palestinian people and the PLO in their struggle to regain the right to self-determination and other fundamental national rights, including the right to return and to establish an independent State in the land of Palestine.

232. We fully support the Syrian Arab Republic in its efforts to reclaim sovereignty over the Golan Heights by all possible means. We commend the Government of Lebanon for its efforts of national reconciliation and demand that Israel withdraw from southern Lebanon immediately and unconditionally. We support the just cause of the Arab people. We support the resolution adopted by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, which, among other things, calls for "a boycott of Israel in the diplomatic, economic, military and cultural fields and in the sphere of maritime and air traffic in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter".[7]

233. The establishment of peace and stability in this important part of the world has become imperative. Numerous solutions have been introduced. Yet, come what may, the only acceptable and effective solution should ensure an end to Israel's acts of aggression and territorial annexation and its withdrawal back to the 1967 boundaries. In the same vein, it should guarantee an end to intervention and interference by imperialist Powers in regional affairs. The process of Camp David is a failure; it can never embrace and solve the present crisis of this region, for it ignores the central issue, that is, the question of Palestine. The only choice now is a solution worked out by an international conference of all parties concerned. We support the good offices of the Secretary-General. We support the efforts to convene, as early as possible, an international conference on the Middle East, as contained in resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983. We find the concrete proposals of 29 July 1984 by the Soviet Union [*see A/39/368*] conducive to the preparation for such a conference.

234. The peaceful settlement of disputes is a fundamental provision enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. We are convinced that the present crisis and conflict in the Middle East can be solved only through a political comprehensive settlement which ensures the legitimate interests of all parties and countries of the region.

235. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): For the past 18 years, the General Assembly has been considering the situation in the Middle East and has adopted scores

of resolutions proclaiming the verdict of the international community on that matter. To the annoyance and indignation of peace-loving humanity, however, the principal parties responsible for the continuation of this most appalling situation, namely, the Zionist forces of Israel and imperialist circles in the United States, have put stumbling-blocks in the way of the implementation of those verdicts.

236. The Middle East, which is one of the most important centres of man's civilization and a permanent crossroad of various cultures, has unfortunately been condemned to war and destruction as a result of the expansionist, aggressive and hegemonistic policies of Israel and the United States for the past four decades. The enormous efforts of the international community to bring peace to this war-torn region of the world were all frustrated due to the intransigence of the Zionist régime and United States unwillingness to take part in, or co-operate with, any serious initiative towards a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

237. As has been proclaimed by the international community time and again, the crux of the Middle East problem is the question of Palestine. The denial by Israel and the United States of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the subsequent confiscation of their land and their forcible expulsion from their home towns has brought about a tragedy, the dimensions of which have grown out of proportion. It is therefore obvious that no just and lasting solution can be found to the situation in the Middle East unless the question of Palestine is taken up in its proper perspective and solved in a manner that would ensure the full exercise by the Palestinian people of their legitimate national rights, including the right to return to their homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to establish their own national State in Palestine. That is why the partial agreements and the collusive deals concluded so far have completely failed to bring closer the achievement of a durable peace in the Middle East, nor have they curbed or even tamed Israel's aggressive and expansionist designs against neighbouring Arab countries.

238. In accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force, the United Nations has condemned the continued occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem, and has called for the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from those territories. Not only has Israel ignored the repeated and unequivocal demands of the international community, but as an occupying Power it has consistently and flagrantly violated all norms of international law applicable to the occupied territories. A systematic campaign of terror and violence against the population of the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories has resulted in a countless number of deaths and enormous sufferings. Peaceful civilians are beaten to death, their properties are confiscated, their houses are demolished, their shops are set ablaze, their places of worship are vandalized, their schools and universities are closed down, their public institutions are paralysed and their elected figures are removed from office.

239. The policy of proliferating Zionist colonial settlements by expanding the old ones and establishing new ones and by depopulating the occupied territories through forced dispersion of the indigenous Arab people from their land has added greatly to the problem. As part of the constant violation of human rights of the population of the occupied territories, Israel has proclaimed so-called laws and regulations which aim at altering the demographic composition, geographic features, basic character and legal status of the occupied territories and has effectively annexed some parts of the occupied territories to Israel.

240. Lebanon, the most recent victim of Israeli aggression, continues to suffer from the occupation of vast areas of its land and brutal attacks on and bombardments of its towns and villages by Israeli forces.

241. The people of the Syrian Golan Heights have also been victims of inhuman repression aimed at forcing them to evacuate the territory, thus making it easier for Israel fully to implement its designs for annexing those areas.

242. The United Nations has adopted resolutions by overwhelming majorities declaring that all Israeli policies and practices aimed at changing the character or status of the occupied territories are illegal, null and void, and have called on Israel to rescind all regulations and laws passed to that effect.

243. Israel has been able to perpetrate its policies and practices in the occupied territories and against its neighbours mainly because it has enjoyed the unreserved and full support of the United States in the diplomatic, political, economic and military fields. The unabated flow of financial and military aid to the Zionist war machine from its so-called strategic ally, the United States, has been instrumental in making possible the arrogant Israeli defiance of the United Nations and the continued state of hostility and tension in the Middle East.

244. This criminal alliance between imperialism and its illegitimate brain-child, zionism, puts equal responsibility for the bloodshed and destruction in the Middle East on the shoulders of those in aggressive circles in the United States. The strong denunciation by the international community of this unholy alliance is a natural reaction to the expansionist militarist policies of the Israeli Zionists, which can be carried out only with the unconditional collaboration of United States imperialism.

245. The United Nations must not allow the present situation in the Middle East to become a permanent feature of the international political scene. Peace is long overdue. The General Assembly, by endorsing, in its resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983, the Geneva Declaration on Palestine[2] and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[3] adopted by the 1983 International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva, has pronounced itself on the ways to attain peace.

246. The proposals of the Soviet Union [*ibid.*] on the achievement of a lasting and comprehensive solution to the question of the Middle East through the convening of an international peace conference also enjoys our full support. The alarming threat to international peace and security posed by the continued deterioration of the situation proves the necessity for the early convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation, fully and on a basis of equality, of the PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The United Nations, particularly the Security

Council, has the major responsibility for providing the appropriate institutional arrangements to guarantee implementation of the expected agreements of this peace conference. We strongly condemn the negative position of the United States and Israel concerning the convening of the proposed conference.

247. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan reiterates its full support for and solidarity with the heroic Palestinian people, the valiant patriotic forces of Lebanon and our Syrian brothers in their legitimate struggle to recover their lands and to safeguard their territories against Israeli invasion.

248. The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

249. Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I apologize for speaking at this late hour, but I feel obliged to respond to the statement made by the representative of Israel this morning [*72nd meeting*]. However, I shall not take much time.

250. We are used to hearing the representative of Israel speak falsely every year in the debate on this item, in order to blur the issues. It is one of the Zionist manoeuvres to which we are accustomed—going into details that have nothing to do with the subject in order to earn the sympathy of the international public for Zionist claims. My delegation has responded in detail many times, most recently when we discussed this item last year, at the thirty-eighth session [*94th meeting*]. We shall not stoop to the level to which the representative of the Zionist entity descended this morning.

251. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): Until this moment I was loath to respond to the remarks of the Jordanian representative. I find I have to go against my inclination because I am speaking here not only as the representative of the State of Israel but also as the representative of the 6 million Jews who were slaughtered by the Nazis in Europe.

252. I say to the representative of Jordan: Have you no decency, Sir? There is a famous Russian saying with which my Soviet colleague will no doubt be familiar: *Vri da znai meru,* which means "Lie, but know when to stop." The Jordanian representative should know when to stop.

253. Most of the families of my colleagues sitting here had members in concentration camps. They had families that were gassed. They had brothers, sisters and cousins who were shot point blank, shipped away, exiled, had horrible experiments performed upon them. Is the representative of Jordan suggesting that that is what Israel's policy is? He knows very well, as everyone here does, that this is the most benign military occupation in history. He knows very well that the Palestinian Arabs have recourse to law, to the Supreme Court, that they are protected by law and order. He knows very well that their living standards, their social standards, their literacy—that by any index of national welfare and individual welfare, they have improved beyond belief under the Israeli administration. This is nazism?

254. But there is perhaps one other factor that I find puzzling, coming from the Jordanian representative. Why is it that under the Jordanian rule more Palestinian Arabs left Judea-Samaria—the area he calls the West Bank—than under Israeli rule? What is making so many of them stream back to this area, to this living hell? Do they have a penchant for self-immolation? They do not. They know the truth.

255. And I think that it is beyond my understanding, beyond the understanding, I think, of any decent person to understand how the Jordanian representative can approach the holocaust with such callousness. Is it possible that he speaks out of ignorance, or out of arrogance—or out of both? This Assembly must consider this as well, because it is not my score or Israel's score with this perversion of truth. It is your score, it is your responsibility. This happened once in this century and it was accompanied by the most violent and gross distortion of language and truth. Let us not let it happen again, not here.

256. Mr. MADADHA (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I apologize for speaking now, but I was rather surprised at what was said by the representative of Israel. I shall not be long. I wish to say only that we know when to stop. We do not ask anyone to teach us when to stop. However, it is truly arrogant of Israel, which does not know when to stop, to tell us when to stop. I repeat what I said this morning [*72nd meeting*]—and I shall not engage in a discussion concerning the massacres of Palestinians and Lebanese under Israeli occupation—what I said this morning I reaffirm anew: the Israeli occupation is a new form of nazism; the time has come for the world to put an end to it.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I, sect. A.

[3] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[4] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[5] A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 101 (*a*).

[6] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1984*, document S/16732.

[7] A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 106 (*d*).

[8] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I, sect. B.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

74th

PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 27 November 1984,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

1. Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again the General Assembly is considering the disquieting, extremely serious and explosive situation in the Middle East. For more than three decades now, we have witnessed constant upheaval in this important and tense region of the world. Nothing indicates now that a solution to the problem of the region is within reach, enabling the area to live in peace, security and understanding. This situation is due to the declared aggressive policy of Israel, aimed at imposing hegemony, domination and expansion through military force and systematic terrorism based on its vast military arsenal and backed by unrestricted external military support. Israel has used this military superiority against the Arab States and has refused to heed the will of the international community and international law. It is generally accepted that the question of Palestine is at the heart of the struggle in our region. That is why it is necessary to reaffirm the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, its right to return to its homeland and to establish its own independent State on its own national soil in Palestine.

2. Among the essential factors for stability in the Middle East are: the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the right of all States of the region to live in peace, as well as the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967.

3. We will not mention all the resolutions of the United Nations concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict but will confine ourselves to resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). In those resolutions, the Security Council, the supreme international body entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, set the bases for peace in the Middle East. But Israel, by creating obstacles, has prevented the implementation of those resolutions. Israel has rejected the latest appeal made to it by King Hussein on the basis of resolution 242 (1967). Yitzhak Shamir rejected that resolution, which, according to him, is an outdated claim; that position was announced by Israeli radio and was published in *The Washington Post* on 25 November 1984.

4. On the pretext of maintaining its security, Israel repeatedly attacks its Arab neighbours, using its enormous military machinery, and has thus transformed the Middle East into a region of strife, international polarization and strategic rivalry between the big Powers.

5. Israel has changed the legal status of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, as well as the demographic and historic character of those territories. It is pursuing its settlement policy and the confiscation by force of the occupied Arab lands in the West Bank. But it is widely accepted that the policy of progressive annexation and *fait accompli* applied by Israel will not change reality.

6. The security to which Israel aspires cannot be ensured, because true security must rest on stability and on a just and lasting peace in the region. Such a peace, in turn, cannot be restored without a comprehensive, just settlement, with the participation of all the parties. The numerous relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, which I need not list here, must be respected.

7. Lebanon remains the focus of international attention because of the tragic situation there. We are in favour of the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon, since the Lebanese are capable of resolving their own problems within the framework of national Lebanese reconciliation.

8. The international community must redouble its efforts to ensure the restoration of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

9. We believe that most of the other problems of the region result from the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In order to end that terrible conflict, the Palestinians must return to their homes from which they have been driven. In addition, international political will must be mobilized in order to find a positive settlement of the problems of the Middle East in the face of Israeli intransigence and arrogance, which have gone beyond all bounds and which constitute flagrant defiance of the will of the international community and the resolutions of the United Nations. Israel cannot continue to deny the Palestinian people its rights. That people has a right to self-determination and to establish its own sovereign State, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 181 (II), adopted on 29 November 1947, which stipulates that a Jewish State and a Palestinian State shall be created in Palestine. The Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*] is the sole legitimate and authentic representative of the Palestinian people.

10. All countries the world over are aware that the Middle East region is of major strategic importance and that the region can only enjoy stability, peace and security if a just solution is found to the Palestinian problem. The future of international

peace and security and the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict depend on this.

11. In this connection, we should like to mention the declaration issued at Venice on 13 June 1980 by the European Council,[1] the statement issued at Brussels on 29 June 1982 by the 10 States members of the European Community[2] and the statement issued at Brussels on 22 March 1983 by the European Council,[3] as well as the attempts of the European States to find a peaceful solution for the region. Those countries have not recognized Israel's policy concerning the Golan Heights and eastern Jerusalem, which they consider to be contrary to international law and null and void.

12. My country is in favour of the convening of an international conference, within the framework defined by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, in order to begin a true process of peace in the Middle East under the auspices of the Security Council. The United Nations is making preparations for that conference on the basis of its political, moral and historic responsibilities.

13. Everyone wants to break the circle of violence, hostility, fear and distrust in the region.

14. What is important is how to translate those principles into real political action. The major Powers must redouble their efforts to bring about a just, peaceful solution, given their special historical responsibilities in regard to the Palestinian problem.

15. President Reagan's peace initiative of 1 September 1982[4] is a constructive plan which could help progress towards peace in the Middle East. The United States should increase its efforts to find a peaceful solution.

16. Similarly, the Arab peace plan, embodied in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[5] contains constructive elements which could promote peaceful action and which reflect the desire of the Arab States and the PLO for a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement.

17. Everything possible must be done to achieve a just peace, given the explosive situation in the region, which could lead to widespread conflict that would reduce to nothing all the progress, prosperity and development achieved by the people of the region.

18. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): Last year, at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly [*94th meeting*], my delegation renewed its expressions of deep concern about the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. At that time, there was little ground for optimism with regard to the future in the light of the series of acts of violence in the area. Since then Brazil has continued to follow closely the evolution of the problems in the area. For years we have also witnessed a succession of proposals, suggestions and negotiations, and in particular the attempts to deal with the question in the United Nations.

19. It is thus with satisfaction that my delegation notes that the debate on the issue before us occurs this year almost simultaneously with the beginning of talks between Israel and Lebanon on the withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces from occupied Lebanese territories. Brazil shares the expectations created by those negotiations. It is our hope that even a limited outcome of this effort to solve one of the many problems in the region may serve as a positive example and lead to new attempts towards the settlement of the other pending disputes in the area. My delegation hopes that the parties will persevere in their work with a view to the early completion of their task.

20. Owing mainly to the presence in my country of a considerable number of Lebanese and their descendants who have been actively participating in Brazil's life for over a century, we have close and fruitful ties with Lebanon. We would thus be specially gratified if in the near future Lebanon's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty were entirely restored and respected, allowing that country then to devote itself to its reconstruction and to resume its traditional roles in regional and international affairs.

21. My delegation considers that measures could and should be taken to overcome the inequities caused by the continuing establishment of Israeli settlements in the West Bank, the illegal annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, and the frequent violation of the rights of the Arab population in the territories occupied by Israel.

22. Let me also again recall our conviction that a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement could be reached on the basis of the following principal elements: complete withdrawal of all forces of occupation from the Arab occupied territories, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973); respect for the right of the Palestinian people to return to Palestine, and recognition of their right of self-determination, independence and sovereignty; participation by the Palestinian people, through the PLO, their sole and legitimate representative, in any negotiations regarding their future; and recognition of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to exist within internationally recognized boundaries.

Mr. Bucci (Italy), Vice-President, took the Chair.

23. It is our hope that five wars, countless conflagrations, numerous missed opportunities for settlement and, above all, great human losses may make it clear that the parties must show a true willingness to negotiate and must recognize the necessity for flexibility and reasonable alternatives. History and the possibility of the emergence of new critical elements in the regional crisis make such an attitude, in my delegation's opinion, the only valid alternative.

24. It must be stressed also that the international community as a whole has an obligation to contribute in every possible way to a positive outcome of the peace processes in the Middle East. To this effect, the United Nations may soon have to reassess its peace-keeping and assistance role in the Middle East and to review the mandate and operations of its forces in the region. My delegation considers that such an effort must also serve the purpose of re-establishing confidence in the Organization and its machinery.

25. As I conclude, may I also refer to the appreciation with which Brazil views the work of the Secretary-General on the Middle East problems. My delegation also expects the parties concerned to recognize his capacity to play an important role and constantly to support and facilitate his attempts to act accordingly.

26. Mr. HUCKE (German Democratic Republic): The Middle East continues to be one of the most dangerous sources of international conflict, posing a serious threat to peace and security in the world. To take the region out of its state of permanent tension

and establish a comprehensive, just and lasting peace is one of the most important tasks of our time.

27. The dangerous developments taking place in that region show, however, that the main obstacle to peace and security in the Middle East is Israel's continued United States-backed policy of expansion. The strategic alliance poses a constant threat to the peace and the existence of the Arab peoples. It reflects the endeavour to draw the Arab region more deeply into the imperialist course of global confrontation.

28. Leading politicians of the United States have repeatedly declared the Middle East to be one of their so-called zones of vital interest. The aim behind this is to dominate that strategically important, resource-rich area. The legitimate interests of the peoples living in the region are completely ignored. Although the policy of direct use of military force and the so-called peace action of the multinational forces in Lebanon have failed, imperialism, now as before, clings to its disastrous course of further enhancing its military presence in the Middle East and of extending the sphere of action of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to that part of the world. This is evident from plans to increase the so-called rapid deployment force, the constant drive to establish new military bases, the staging of provocative military manoeuvres and the attempts to create pretexts for deploying military units off the Lebanese coast, in the Gulf and in the Red Sea.

29. The German Democratic Republic resolutely rejects the imperialist policy of blackmail, use of force and interference in the internal affairs of the Arab States. It demands the accelerated and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanon in accordance with Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) as the prerequisite for securing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

30. In the debates during this session of the General Assembly, representatives of several States have quite rightly pointed to the direct link that exists between the tense international situation, arising from the aggressive course of imperialist circles, and the aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

31. In this context, it is only natural that there should be growing concern about the deployment of United States medium-range missiles that has begun in Western Europe and that constitutes a threat also to the Near and Middle East.

32. Shielded and encouraged by the imperialist course of global confrontation and arms buildup, the ruling circles of Israel are escalating their policy of aggression and occupation and threatening the Arab peoples with new acts of aggression. The Arab people of Palestine is denied its legitimate right to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State. The Israeli rulers are stepping up the entrenchment of their occupation régime in the illegally occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories. They are intensifying their illegal settlement policies. Every day new crimes are perpetrated against the Palestinian population. Israel's ruling circles have now embarked on the step-by-step incorporation of the occupied territories in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip after annexing, in contravention of international law, East Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights. After its criminal aggression against Lebanon in 1982, Israel still occupies one third of the territory of that Arab State. With their actions in Lebanon, the Israeli occupiers seek to apply in southern Lebanon the colonization practices tried out in the occupied West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan Heights.

33. The German Democratic Republic is in agreement with the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations in once again strongly condemning Israel's continued policy of aggression and occupation and in demanding its immediate and unconditional withdrawal from all territories occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem. It supports the demand for the application of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, contained in the Final Communiqué [*A/39/560, annex*], adopted at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984.

34. It has repeatedly been proved in this forum that the Israeli rulers could not arrogantly defy relevant United Nations decisions on the Middle East and the question of Palestine and violate international law without the support they receive from the imperialist super-Power to carry out their expansionist ambitions. Only a few weeks ago, the United States and Israel entered into new arrangements concerning the further expansion of their strategic alliance against the Arab peoples.

35. In the light of the deep crisis that Israel is undergoing as a result of the war policies pursued by its leadership, its ruling circles seek to obtain military, economic and financial aid from the United States at an unprecedented high level. According to official statements by representatives of the United States Administration, Israeli demands find a ready ear in the United States. It is therefore only too understandable that more and more countries oppose the collaboration between the United States and Israel. The Final Communiqué of the Meeting of Non-Aligned Countries mentioned above states the following on this point:

> "The Ministers and Heads of Delegation condemned Israel for intensifying its aggressive practices and escalating its expansionist militarist policies. They denounced once again the continued support provided by the Government of the United States for these Israeli practices and acts as well as all forms of American assistance, particularly the agreements of mutual co-operation between them within the framework of their strategic alliance which threatens the security of the region and the world, and confirms the United States' total partiality towards Israel." [*Ibid., para. 60.*]

36. In view of the aggressive anti-peace policy pursued by Israel and its imperialist allies, it is imperative to intensify collective efforts in order resolutely to counteract the dangerous developments in the Middle East.

37. The German Democratic Republic, which, since its founding 35 years ago, has sided with all those who stand for the right of peoples to national sovereignty and self-determination, reiterates its full support for those States and patriotic forces in the Arab region offering heroic resistance to imperialist plots and Israeli acts of aggression, and unswervingly defends their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. It reaffirms its solidarity with the peoples of Syria, Lebanon and Palestine in their

struggle against Israel's policy of aggression and expansion.

38. The German Democratic Republic strongly opposes all imperialist attempts to revive the failed policy of separate deals.

39. Together with the majority of States Members of the United Nations, the German Democratic Republic favours the convening of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned, including the PLO. It believes that central to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East is the implementation of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinians, in particular their right to self-determination and to the establishment of their own independent State. The German Democratic Republic will continue its efforts to support the just cause of the Palestinian people. It expresses its firm belief that a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem, with the question of Palestine at its core, can be brought about only through the collective efforts of all the parties, including the PLO, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

40. In line with its principled position on the Middle East problem and the question of Palestine, the German Democratic Republic fully supports the proposals on a Middle East settlement put forward by the Soviet Union on 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*]. It also welcomes the decisions taken on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[5] concerning a settlement of the Middle East problem. They all point the way to a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict.

41. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of the Zionist entity made a statement in the Assembly yesterday [*72nd meeting*] at the end of which he tried to reach a conclusion to what he had said . . .

42. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

43. Mr. GVIR (Israel): Mr. President, I should be grateful to you if you would request the speaker to comply with the rules and procedures of the Assembly and refer accordingly to Member States by their names and not engage in name-calling.

44. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Qatar may continue, bearing in mind what has just been said.

45. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I shall heed the directive of the President, but I request the President to ask the representative of Israel to use the proper name when he speaks of the PLO. He should call the PLO by the name chosen by the people themselves, a name recognized by the entire world and by the United Nations.

46. Yesterday, the representative of the Zionist entity made a statement in the Assembly—I am sorry—the representative of Israel made a statement in the Assembly at the end of which he tried to reach a conclusion to what he had said by stating: "That problem consists of two elements: first, the propensity of Arab political culture to employ violence to resolve conflicts at all levels;"* [*ibid., para. 105*].

47. This is the conclusion the representative wished to reach, that Arab political culture and practice is based on the use of violence at all levels. Consequently, Arabs are different from other people and inferior. We can well understand this logic on the part of that representative because the Zionist speaker and racist zionism can only understand things on this basis; as an Arab proverb puts it: They are judging others through themselves.

48. That representative analysed the situation in the Middle East on the basis of the racist nature of zionism, which is based on discrimination between men and nations. He is therefore being consistent with what he said last week [*69th meeting*] on the situation in South Africa.

49. It is paradoxical that the racist Nazis in Germany based their logic and their practices against the Jews on the same arguments and doctrines put forward by the representative of Israel when analysing the situation in the Middle East. The racist Nazis thought that the Jews had a culture and politics, an economy and a civilization which distinguished them from the rest of mankind and that they were inferior to the Aryan race. Today, the representative of those who were persecuted yesterday by Nazi racism uses the same language and logic with regard to the Arabs.

50. The problem of the Middle East remains one of the most urgent international problems and the focus of the concern of the United Nations, as it has been ever since the Organization was created. Although the elements of this problem existed before the United Nations was founded, the deterioration of the situation and its dangerous nature date from the founding of the Organization. It is disappointing that the United Nations, which had succeeded in solving many of the world's problems, in particular the problem of decolonization, a few years after its creation, is still unable to find any solution to the Middle East problem in spite of the fact that this question has been before the various organs of the Organization every year. However, there are no signs yet that there is any chance of a comprehensive solution based on justice that would maintain international peace and security, which today are threatened by the persistence of this problem, its deterioration and its explosive nature.

51. In spite of the fact that the United Nations has made praiseworthy efforts and adopted many resolutions on all aspects of Israeli aggression, the unlimited support and assistance provided to Israel by certain Members of the Organization, as well as the use of the veto against any draft resolution in the Security Council that would attempt to safeguard or restore the rights of those involved, has encouraged Israel to defy those resolutions, to be intransigent and to disregard the will of the international community.

52. The question of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East conflict and the essential reason for the deplorable situation in the region. My delegation will examine the question of Palestine in the course of the consideration of that agenda item. That is why we shall confine ourselves at this stage to making certain observations.

53. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June 1982 was energetically condemned by the United Nations in Security Council resolution 509 (1982), which called on Israel to withdraw its forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Unfortunately, that resolution remains a dead letter. The forces of aggression are still in occupation of southern Lebanon and Israel is trying to impose its terms and gain privileges, and not to have to withdraw its forces, in defiance of the

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

will of the international community and in violation of the norms of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibit the use of force in international relations.

54. The practices of the occupation forces of Israel in southern Lebanon have been condemned by the Security Council in resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982), which call on Israel to respect the rights of the civilian population, in accordance with international conventions, in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[6] However, there is no juridical state of war now in southern Lebanon, but rather a persistent and aggressive occupation based solely on blind force and without any juridical foundation. Unfortunately, the most recent complaint, last September, to the Security Council by Lebanon against these practices did not yield positive results because of the use of the veto by one of the great Powers when the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon[7] was voted on. Thus the deplorable situation in Lebanon persists. Israeli arrangements and practices, which have made the life of the people of southern Lebanon hell, are justified by the occupying Power as being necessary to maintain its own security and that of its forces. This is a distortion of the truth and a denial of logic itself, because the Israeli troops have no right to be in southern Lebanon. Those forces have put themselves into a situation which exposes them to the normal reactions only to be expected from a population whose soil has been occupied and who find themselves obliged to repel the aggressor by all the means available to them. The heroic resistance of the Lebanese people deserves the admiration and appreciation of the whole world.

55. Israel still has a free hand in the occupied Arab territories and refuses to withdraw, as if international law did not embody the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force and as if the General Assembly had not repeatedly called upon it to end its illegitimate practices: the application of its jurisdiction in the occupied territories; the establishment of settlements in those territories; the pursuit of its long-term plan aimed at modifying the juridical status and character of Jerusalem; the elimination of the elected mayors in the West Bank; and the killing of peaceful demonstrators. We could give a very long list of the illegal Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories. Those practices have been condemned by the international community but they are still continuing and being intensified, in total disregard of the will of the international community and the principles of human rights. The most recent manifestation of these practices are the acts of Israeli terrorism against the Arab population, in which the Israeli authorities are involved and which, consequently, become State terrorism against unarmed, innocent civilians. We should not allow our attention to be diverted by these practices from the illegitimacy of Israel's occupation of the Arab territories, including Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. The basis of the problem is the need to put an end to the occupation and to Israeli practices, which have been condemned by the international community almost unanimously, but which are only secondary manifestations of the fundamental problem, namely, the persistence of the Israeli occupation.

56. The search for a peaceful solution to the problems of the Middle East continues to occupy the attention of the United Nations. The General Assembly, in resolution 38/180 D, reaffirmed that a just and comprehensive settlement of the situation in the Middle East cannot be achieved without the participation on an equal footing of all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The Assembly reaffirmed the call for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all the parties concerned and the two super-Powers, under the auspices of the United Nations.

57. My delegation hopes that the General Assembly will reaffirm that resolution at the current session—with the approval of all—in conformity with the unanimous will of the international community that this conference be held as the best means of bringing about a comprehensive and just settlement. Israel, by its refusal to agree to participate in such a conference, is demonstrating to the international community once again its intransigence and its refusal to bring about peace based on justice. My delegation believes that the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East, as defined by the General Assembly in resolution 38/180 D, is one way of bringing about a peaceful, just and global settlement on the well-known and universally accepted basis of the restoration of all the occupied territories and the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and to the creation of its own State on its own soil.

58. We wish to refer here to the Holy City of Jerusalem, which is part of the occupied territories; conquest by force must not be admitted and the occupier must be forced to withdraw. We wish to highlight the particular importance of the Holy City, which is so dear to the entire Arab nation and the Islamic world. For this reason, the application of the principle of the non-acquisition of territories by force, as applicable to Jerusalem, is extremely important, much more so than in the case of the other occupied territories. Without the restoration of Jerusalem, there can be no solution that can be just and acceptable to the Arabs. At the present time, the international community must clearly reaffirm that Israel's arrangements and practices aimed at changing the physical character, demographic composition and legal status of Jerusalem are null and void, as has been affirmed in General Assembly resolutions at previous sessions.

59. The situation in the Middle East has been at the very heart of United Nations concerns for 37 years, and despite this its collective and individual efforts have not led to a peaceful, just and global settlement because those efforts have been concentrated on the symptoms and not the causes of the evil. The result of all military confrontation, after hostilities had ceased, has been the cessation of such efforts and the acceptance of the *fait accompli.* Efforts then turn towards new conflicts. An arbitrary approach to dealing with a world problem of extreme danger to international peace and security like the Middle East cannot bring about the required solution nor restore peace to the region. This is the lesson which I hope all States of the world have learned over the last 40 years; that is why the international community must adopt a different approach in dealing with this problem, which must not be left unresolved, because the consequences would be serious not only for the region but for international peace and security.

60. No State Member of the United Nations can have failed to note what the Secretary-General asserted in his reports to this and the previous session of the General Assembly on the ill effect on the prestige and credibility of the United Nations of the persistence of the Middle East problem and the incapacity of the United Nations to resolve it. Although the United Nations has been considering this problem, which it created, for almost 40 years, all efforts extended over this period have not led to the comprehensive settlement that was hoped for. That is why the international community, represented by the United Nations, must strive to find a settlement on the basis of a new approach, so that peace can be restored to this sensitive region and the United Nations can regain credibility and its unique role in the eyes of the world.

61. Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland): It is obvious to any objective observer that a problem that preoccupies both statesmen and public opinion and concerns one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension in the world, the explosive situation in the Middle East, though it is fraught with the tangible danger of becoming the flash-point of a global confrontation, has become a somewhat routine perennial agenda item of the General Assembly.

62. So many statements have been delivered on this subject, so many resolutions adopted with the support of an overwhelming majority of Member States, yet the situation in the Middle East has continued to evolve as if nothing had happened in the United Nations at all.

63. With cynical, scornful disdain for the decisions of this world body and for international public opinion, Israel continues its expansionist policy towards Arab countries, expands its well-planned colonization of the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip and, as developments of recent days bear witness, such as the fatal shooting of two Palestinian youths, one of them a student of Bir Zeit University, carries out further repressive measures against the population of the occupied Arab territories and, in particular, against the Palestinians.

64. The withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from southern Lebanon has still not taken place. Therefore, anyone who is even superficially acquainted with the present situation in the region and familiar with but one General Assembly resolution, namely, the latest one adopted on this question, resolution 38/180, could legitimately ask the obvious question: Why did it happen, why was it allowed to happen?

65. If agenda item 36 bears any resemblance to any other agenda item it is certainly to item 31, entitled "Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa". Even though those two items are a continent apart geographically, and might, at least to some, appear to have little in common as far as their substance is concerned, they have in fact one very important thing in common, namely, the reason why the Assembly still keeps them on its agenda in spite of so many years of debate and scores of resolutions. That reason is the fact that, in their respective aggressive policies, both Israel and South Africa enjoy the support and assistance of powerful friends, in particular the United States, which in the case of Israel officially calls itself a strategic ally of that country.

66. Addressing the current session of the General Assembly, on 28 September, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Mr. Stefan Olszowski, stated that behind most current regional conflicts and tensions

> "we detect both the goals and the results of an imperialist policy based on a position of strength and designed to preserve the remnants of colonialism and reinforce neo-colonial practices and racism. Ample evidence of this is provided by the history of the prolonged and appallingly tragic conflict in the Middle East." [*12th meeting, para. 232.*]

67. The expansionism of Israel thrives on the full support of the United States, which, in the framework of its policy of global confrontation, sees in it a useful tool for achieving political hegemony in the region, including the strengthening of its military presence. The implementation of the Israeli-American agreement on strategic co-operation is an expression of their joint venture, consolidating Israel's gains from its string of acts of aggression and enhancing United States interests in the area. At the same time, the vital interests of the peoples of the region and the question of the establishment of a lasting, just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East are being relegated to second place at best.

68. While noting the failure of the United States policy of pressing for piecemeal solutions and enforcing the concept of unilateral settlements—and American activities in and around Lebanon in 1982 and 1983 are a glaring case in point—we notice at the same time the negative attitude of both Washington and Tel Aviv towards initiatives aimed at a comprehensive solution of the Middle East problem and, in particular, opposition to the idea of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East. This tendency is being manifested in the position taken by those two countries with regard to the initiative of the Secretary-General put forward pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983. It might be worth while to recall at this juncture that resolution 38/58 C was adopted by 124 votes in favour to 4 against—including, of course, those of Israel and the United States—with 15 abstentions, all but two of them by Western countries.

69. The experiences of past decades have demonstrated beyond any doubt that an effective settlement of the Middle East conflict has to be based on the principles of comprehensive treatment of all its aspects, stability of solutions and appropriate taking into account of the interests of the peoples of the region. In the Middle East one simply cannot establish the lasting peace and the security of some at the expense of the basic rights and interests of others. Moreover, attempts to induce partial solutions or to impose unilateral formulas not only do not lead to a lasting settlement of the conflict, but, as recent years have amply shown, bring about new complications and lead to new tensions, prolonging the tragedy of the Middle East peoples.

70. Poland has steadfastly and consistently been advocating a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict. We see a practical way towards achieving a comprehensive settlement through the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned, including the PLO. We expressed this position, together with other socialist States, in the Political Declaration adopted at Prague on 5 January 1983 by the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty.[8] We have also

supported the initiative of the Secretary-General regarding the convening of such a conference. Consequently, in a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of 10 August 1984, we came out strongly in support of the proposals of the Soviet Union on a Middle East settlement of 29 July 1984 [*A/39/368*]. As pointed out subsequently by the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement to the current session of the Assembly, to which I referred earlier:

> "Now that the sterility and fragility of any settlement predicated on forcing the Arab world to conclude separatist agreements with Israel have been so starkly revealed, solutions of a universal, equitable and lasting nature can be all the more irrefutably seen to be the only effective ones. They are guaranteed by the programme of action set out in the Soviet Union's proposals on a Middle East settlement of 29 July 1984. Poland reiterates its complete readiness to make a positive contribution to the implementation of that programme." [*12th meeting, para. 232.*]

71. The Soviet proposals are a logical expansion of and elaboration on the guidelines adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, and subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, specifically paragraphs 3 and 4.

72. As to the link between the question of the Middle East and that of Palestine, a simple reiteration of the long-obvious fact that the problem of Palestine constitutes the core of the Middle East conflict would be enough. To translate that fact into United Nations terms, it should suffice to refer to General Assembly resolution 37/86 C of 10 December 1982, in which the Assembly, *inter alia*, reiterated the responsibility of the United Nations to strive for a lasting peace in the Middle East through a just solution of the problem of Palestine.

73. Poland, a country always vitally interested in the strengthening of international peace and security, a country presenting a firm, consistent and constructive position on the situation in the Middle East, has for the past 11 years been doing more than giving merely verbal support to the cause of peace in that region. Since October 1973, Polish soldiers have been serving in the Middle East under the United Nations flag, first in UNEF and later, until this day, in UNDOF. Their selfless and dedicated service constitutes my country's direct and tangible contribution to the restoration of peace in the region. We thus back up our words with deeds.

74. At the same time, we hope that in the near future all the measures and actions necessary to enable a lasting, just and peaceful settlement to be achieved in the Middle East to which I referred earlier in my statement will finally be implemented, extinguishing once and for all the dangerous hotbed of tension that is the Middle East conflict and thus enhancing the overall security of the world at large.

75. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Middle East, Palestine, the West Bank and Gaza, the Golan, Lebanon, Israeli practices in the occupied territories, the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor bring to mind an endless sequence of crimes and violations committed by Israel. Violations of the Charter of the United Nations, of international law, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the decisions of every organ of the United Nations—all such violations, which sap the energy of the United Nations, have been committed by Israel, which occupies a seat here with other members and shamelessly challenges all these values.

76. The representatives of the Arab States are now sitting in this General Assembly Hall. The Arab States' share in the problem of the Middle East has been in having to endure invasion, suffering, aggression and crimes for no reason or justification. It is even more offensive to have to observe those crimes and that aggression being justified by some of those sitting here, although we are sure that most of the Member States represented here are anxious to establish the truth and lay the foundations for a just peace. Also sitting in this General Assembly Hall are representatives of the Israeli authorities, the perpetrators of those crimes of aggression and expansion and of other crimes against humanity and the rights of other States and individuals.

77. The whole Middle East is an area of Israeli aggression. The entire world knows by now that Israel is planning to acquire the capacity to commit aggression beyond the Middle East.

78. What entity in the world today, other than the Zionist entity in Palestine, poses a threat to its neighbours, commits direct aggression against a whole region and is a potential threat to those outside the region?

79. In Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Palestine it is the same story of daily, flagrant aggression. As for terrorism, international terrorism, talk about it continues and the subject-matter is well known to representatives.

80. The real issue is the nature of this Israeli aggression. Peoples fight and struggle for known and clear objectives, but Israel commits aggression and each time we discover a new motive for it. Events have proved false the claim that Israel attacks to protect itself. It has been the aggressor each and every time. On the other hand, each such aggression has increased its vulnerability, undermined its security, increased the danger to the region and heightened the possibility of confrontation—all of which expose that entity to still more danger. Representatives are aware, the world is aware and history has recorded that although Israel may win one, two or even 10 rounds, it is bound to lose the final round against peoples which have a superior capacity to endure in every respect, however long the conflict may last, because its existence depends solely on winning military rounds, as has proved to be the case so far.

81. The Israeli adventure is directed at the existence of the Middle East region as a whole—the whole Middle East, with its potential, its capabilities, the independence of its people and their progress and development. Has the history of the world ever known anything more dangerous than this? History has also testified that adventurism against the existence of nations has always ended to the detriment of the adventurer, however long it may take.

82. If we try to confine our discussion to the development of the situation in the Middle East and the acts of aggression and violations of one full year only, from the previous session of the General Assembly to the current session, we find that Israel has continued its aggression, in disregard of the United Nations, and its crimes against the peoples and States in Palestine, Lebanon and Syria. Southern

Lebanon and the Golan Heights continue to be occupied and subjected to all sorts of crimes and violations. The West Bank and Gaza are experiencing forms of injustice, aggression and invasion that were never practised by the Nazis in the darkest days of their occupation of foreign countries.

83. There is no difference between one Government and another in Israel. They are all partners in the crime against the West Bank and Gaza. They are all partners in the crime against the Golan. They are all partners in the crime against Lebanon. They have been partners in the crime against Palestine. They are still partners, as long as the land is occupied and the people do not enjoy their full and absolute rights, no matter what the language of the official declarations and the unofficial promises by their numerous parties. Those crimes that have been committed are not the result of a month-old or year-old decision. They are part of the Zionists' scheme from the beginning of their designs against Arab lands, starting with Palestine.

84. In the Golan, they have shamelessly declared the annexation of Syrian territory. In the West Bank and Gaza, they have been shamelessly silent on acts of Judaization, expulsion, land confiscation and building of settlements. Lebanon, an independent country, was arrogantly invaded and occupied in 1982 and its right of sovereignty is being bargained over today.

85. Of all the crimes that Israel has committed there is not a single one that has not been the subject of a warning by the United Nations; nor is there a single one that has not been condemned afterwards by the United Nations and which Israel has not been asked to refrain from committing. On the other hand, not a single one of those crimes has been abandoned by Israel out of respect for the United Nations or international law.

86. I should like to say to those who attempt to protect and support Israel in the United Nations or who keep silent on its crimes that they are doing the worst disservice to the Zionist entity, because the latter will think that such protection can insulate it from the march of history which is moving against it. Moreover, those who are protecting Israel in this international Organization share with it a responsibility that echoes throughout the world, with the worst reverberations in the Arab countries and the entire Muslim world. It is time for them to understand reality and to look beyond their narrow field of vision.

87. Golda Meir, the late Prime Minister of Israel, stated in 1969: "There is no such thing as Palestinians. They do not exist." Golda Meir is gone, but the Palestinians, the rightful owners of the land, remain. But this is the real Zionist objective with regard to Palestine and the Middle East. The tragedy is growing and its dangers are spreading. Israel's former Defence Minister, Sharon, in a lecture to the Center for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv in 1982, referred to what he called "the remote strategic lands peripheral and vital to Israel". He declared in that lecture that:

> "the strategic and security interests of Israel must be widened to include 80 States, beside the Arab, Middle Eastern States and the States of the Red Sea region—States such as Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and other States in the Gulf region and Africa, particularly the countries of North and Central Africa."

88. Let us consider how the Israeli occupation authorities in Lebanon have destroyed the economic infrastructure of the areas they have occupied in order to render them uncompetitive and dependent upon the Israeli economy. They concentrated on destroying industrial installations. They pillaged Beirut Airport and other facilities, including all the modern electronic equipment that had made Beirut Airport and Lebanese factories among the most advanced of their kind in the region.

89. The barbaric massacres perpetrated by the Israeli occupation authorities against Lebanese, Palestinian and Syrian civilians constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity, according to the definitions of international law. Israel must bring individuals and bodies responsible for these crimes to international trial. The report of the international commission established in 1982 to investigate Israeli violations of international law during its invasion of Lebanon,[9] presided over by Mr. Sean MacBride, has pointed out how heinous these crimes were.

90. The immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon is a Lebanese, Arab and international demand. Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) strongly support the determination of the international community to effect the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory.

91. Israel's premeditated and determined aggression and occupation make it fully responsible for reparations. The payment of reparations is one of the basic concepts of international law and includes reparations for the destruction of property and for human and material losses, in addition to other damages caused by the aggressor to States and individuals.

92. The General Assembly must, as a matter of principle, condemn in the strongest terms, and to the maximum extent provided in the Charter of the United Nations, Israel's attitude, actions and practices in the region. Israel must be made to bear full responsibility for the crimes it has committed and for compensation. This responsibility must be borne by its leaders and officials as individuals, and by the Israeli entity as a whole for having put these individuals in positions which allowed them to commit these acts. States that support the Zionist policy in the United Nations must also bear responsibility for supporting these acts and for remaining silent while such acts were being perpetrated. History shows that remaining silent about a crime is just as harmful as the crime itself and leads to the repetition of those crimes. The record of the proceedings of the Nuremberg trials, after the Second World War, bears testimony to this.

93. We must take a firm stand here, leaving no room for misinterpretation of the international community's stand with respect to this series of crimes: crimes against humanity, crimes against States, and crimes against the international community as a whole. We should leave no margin for misunderstanding the international community's firm position rejecting any justification for these crimes and on remaining silent about them, not to mention support for such criminals in one way or another. Just ask the Israeli authorities today if Israel is more secure or better off than it was yesterday. The increasing frequency of its crimes will lead Israel to the same end that every adventurous criminal in history has

met. Injustice does not build the foundations of a State. The Arabs have right on their side, for, as the wise sages once said: "A State based on injustice can last but an hour, but a State based on justice will last to the day of judgement."

94. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): In joining this debate on the situation in the Middle East, we cannot but feel the heavy burden of a set of serious interrelated problems which have grown in complexity in an atmosphere of constant political and military confrontation during the past 37 years.

95. It was on 29 November 1947 that the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II), on the future government of Palestine, recommending the implementation of a "Plan of Partition with Economic Union", by 33 votes in favour to 13 against, with 10 abstentions. Turkey was among those Members that had sufficient reasons to cast a negative vote on that resolution. What happened in the General Assembly so long ago may now be regarded as part of the history of the conflict in the Middle East, but it should also help to remind us of the basic reasons why the problem has remained unresolved, when we recall that even that plan spoke of an Arab State in Palestine.

96. The absence of a Palestinian Arab State, the denial of the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people and the continued occupation of the Arab territories lie at the root of the Middle East conflict.

97. The situation and developments in the Middle East have always been and continue to be of particular interest and importance to Turkey, for a number of vital reasons.

98. The concern we feel for that region is a natural consequence of our geographical location in the Middle East, our historical experience and the mutual ties of fraternity between the Turkish nation and the Arab peoples.

99. The Arab-Israeli conflict and the question of Palestine, which lies at the heart of this bitter dispute, have dimensions that go much beyond those of a regional problem. Therefore, the goal of achieving peace and stability in the Middle East has tremendous importance not only for the region itself but, equally, for world peace and security. The Middle East longs for stability and a just peace, which has been lacking long enough. Contributing to the replacement of the perpetual tension and conflict in the region by a negotiated comprehensive settlement constitutes an important priority of Turkish foreign policy in the Middle East. In this context, we have always felt it our sincere duty to support the just cause of Arab peoples and have joined in the calls for an end to aggressive policies by Israel.

100. The General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations have, through numerous resolutions, given firm support to the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination and to the creation of an independent Palestinian State, without which no settlement can be comprehensive, just and enduring.

101. There is a direct link between this paramount necessity and the withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem. A policy of annexation and the expansion of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories does not lead to a peaceful future in the region and defies the will of the international community. It has been determined by the Security Council that Israel's policy of establishing settlements in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 has no validity and constitutes serious obstruction to the achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Israel has also been called upon to comply with its obligations under the relevant international conventions for the protection of civilian persons and to desist from changing the legal status, physical character, institutional structure and demographic composition of the Palestinian and other Arab territories under its occupation. Israel's violations of human rights and its policies and actions in the occupied territories have been repeatedly condemned by the General Assembly. Israel has the responsibility and obligation to put an end to its repressive policies and to withdraw completely from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967. World public opinion is aware that the violation of human rights in the occupied territories and Israeli practices in violation of international law will cease only when the Palestinian people can enjoy their right to self-determination and the Golan Heights are reintegrated into Syrian territory, where they belong.

102. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 was a grave act of aggression which violated the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of that country and led to a tragic loss of life among the civilian population, including that caused by the massacres in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila. After repeated calls on Israel during the past two and a half years to withdraw from Lebanon, the talks between the military authorities of Lebanon and Israel can only be described as a step in the right direction. The attention of international public opinion is focused on these talks; the importance of their successful conclusion for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon is recognized. The Lebanese people have endured tremendous suffering and losses. They should be left free to pursue their path of national reconciliation, which will contribute to the overall stability of the region.

103. Turning our attention to the chances of achieving a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, we wish to commend the realistic assessment of the situation by the Secretary-General in his report [*A/39/600*]. We agree that delay has not facilitated the solution of the problem in any way, and new layers of complexity have been added with each new war in the region and the passage of time. As he has pointed out, the Middle East conflict can ultimately be fully resolved only by a comprehensive settlement covering all its aspects, including the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab territories occupied since 1967; respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of every State in the area and for its right to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries; and a just settlement of the Palestinian problem based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination and the right to create their own independent national State. The preservation of, and the ensuring of respect for, the unique character and special status of the Holy City of Jerusalem also constitute an indispensable element for a just peace in the Middle East.

104. It is obvious that a comprehensive settlement can be achieved only through a process of negotiations in which all the parties concerned participate, including, on an equal footing, the PLO.

105. We believe the time has come for another determined effort to pursue the opportunities created by a number of proposals and plans that have been put forward in recent years, including the eight-point peace plan contained in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[5] and the guidelines contained in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983.[10] The convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, is a proposal which should be patiently pursued in view of the considerable support it enjoys. In order to give fresh momentum to the search for peace in the Middle East, the elements of various initiatives should be constructively utilized to help build a negotiating structure. We believe it is time for all the parties to the Middle East conflict to avail themselves of the services of the Secretary-General in order to move steadily toward this goal.

106. We are confident that, once peace burgeons in the Middle East, all the nations concerned will do their utmost to keep and further promote it, mindful of what they have suffered in its regrettable absence.

107. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Next year we shall be marking the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The history of the consideration of the Middle East conflict in the United Nations is almost as long. Whole generations of people in the Middle East have been born and grown up against the grim background of war. All the efforts undertaken so far to break the tragic and dangerous circle of violence in this part of the world have led at the very best to fragile truces which sooner or later have given way to new and even bloodier carnage. This conflict has led to untold loss of human life and material damage.

108. One does not need to be blessed with any special powers of perspicacity to see who is responsible for the persistence of the Middle East conflict, particularly the very heart and core of this conflict, the Palestinian problem. Responsibility, first and foremost, belongs to the ruling circles of Israel, since it is they who, for more than three decades, have been pursuing a policy of aggression and expansionism against neighbouring Arab States and peoples. The victims of Israeli aggression have been successively Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Lebanon.

109. However, the main thrust of Israeli aggression has been, and remains, against the Arab people of Palestine, whose land has become the target of a policy of colonial conquest and expansion unprecedented in this last quarter of the twentieth century. For 18 years now the whole world has watched the Israeli leaders methodically and deliberately clearing the way on Palestinian soil for the creation of their own mini-empire.

110. Official statements and practical acts on the part of the Israeli authorities have reflected their clear intent to annex the territory of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip, which they seized in 1967. Along with the economic plundering of Palestinian land, the illegal alteration of its juridical status, demographic structure and historical character, Israel has systematically escalated terror and violence against the indigenous Arab population. It is constantly instituting new forms of political, economic, social and cultural discrimination and has been doing everything it can to break the will to resistance of the Palestinians. On the land expropriated by the occupiers, large numbers of Israeli settlements are spreading. Israel stops at nothing in its attempts to exclude the least possibility of a return to the West Bank and Gaza of their legitimate inhabitants and owners, and to deprive the Palestinian people of its inalienable right, the right to an independent life in its own homeland.

111. Israel has also been pursuing a policy of conquest with regard to the Syrian Golan Heights. The open annexation of the Golan Heights by Tel Aviv in 1981, as well as the annexation of East Jerusalem, were acts of naked international brigandage.

112. The culmination of the policy of aggression by Israel was the large-scale invasion of Lebanon and the occupation of the southern regions of that country, which continues to this very day. For three years now, the Israeli occupiers have been holding sway on Lebanese soil, making wide use of their wealth of colonial experience acquired in the Arab territories seized earlier. They have virtually isolated the south of Lebanon where they have established a harsh occupation régime, and every day they are trampling underfoot the most elementary norms of international humanitarian law. Israel has persistently refused to comply with Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which call for the immediate and unreserved withdrawal of the aggressor's forces from Lebanese territory. They have been doing everything they can to impose on the Lebanese such conditions as would enable Tel Aviv to continue to behave as if they owned southern Lebanon.

113. The blame for the persistence of the Middle East conflict belongs equally to the senior partner of Israel in the "strategic alliance", that is, the United States. It is its generous military, economic and financial assistance which enables Tel Aviv in practical terms to pursue its adventuristic policies. It is its limitless and unreserved support which serves as a political shield for the Israeli expansionists.

114. Together with Israel, the United States for many years has deliberately been creating obstacles to constructive international efforts to bring about a radical solution to the Middle East problems. In so far as concerns the American "initiatives" themselves in the field of a settlement, they have always boiled down in one way or another to imposing on the Arabs terms amounting to capitulation.

115. However, the development of events in the Middle East has made abundantly clear the futility of the approach of violence to solving the problems of this region. The policy of imposing separate deals has run up against the staunch resistance of patriotic forces in the Arab world. It was only to be expected that the attempt to impose upon the Palestinians paper autonomy according to the Camp David recipe was a failure. The same fate befell the American plan put forward two years ago for a pseudo-solution to the Middle East problems, which in essence was a touched-up version of the same Camp David line. The intervention of the United States Marines in Lebanon ended in ignominious fiasco. The Lebanese Government tore up the one-sided imposed agreement.

116. However, apparently the United States and Israel have still not learned their lesson and are continuing to think, in outmoded terms, of separate deals and manoeuvring behind the scenes. How else can we explain the openly obstructionist policy pursued by Washington with regard to the General Assembly resolution approved last year by an overwhelming majority, calling for the preparation and convening of an international conference on the Middle East? A similarly negative attitude to the conference is being demonstrated by Israel's leaders, who are sacrificing on the altar of their ambitions the long-term interests of their own people.

117. In complete contrast to this approach to the problems of the Middle East is the policy of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is seeking no one-sided economic, political or military advantages for itself in the Middle East. Soviet policy is based first and foremost on the recognition of the true vital interests of the States of the Middle East themselves. The Soviet Union is bringing into this area no naval units, it is not sending its marines there, nor is it carrying on any military manoeuvres on foreign territory.

118. The Soviet Union has consistently supported the just cause of the Arab peoples. The Arabs are well aware that in the struggle for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and for the restoration of their flouted rights, they have always been able to count on our support and assistance. Any idea, therefore, of squeezing the Soviet Union out of the Middle East and undermining the traditional friendly Soviet-Arab relations is as futile as it ever was. Experience has shown that, on the contrary, relations of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Arab States are becoming stronger every year. It must be absolutely clear that the Soviet Union has played and will continue to play an active part in the search for peace in this part of the world, which is situated in direct proximity to our southern borders, and in the struggle against attempts to impose upon the Arabs injustice, diktat and hegemony.

119. The Soviet proposals on the Middle East of 29 July 1984 [*A/39/368*] are based on the universally acknowledged principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. This means that the Israelis must return to the Arabs all the lands they have occupied since 1967: the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan, including East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the southern part of Lebanon.

120. The Soviet proposals are predicated on the proposition that, without the exercise of the inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and to establish their own independent State, peace in the Middle East is impossible.

121. At the same time, the Soviet proposals do justice to all parties to the Middle East conflict. They are aimed at guaranteeing the right of all States of the region to a secure and independent existence and at ending the state of war and establishing peace among those States. It is proposed that international guarantees of the settlement of the Middle East problem should be given, in which the Soviet Union is ready to participate.

122. The Soviet initiative is not confined to laying down the general principles of a settlement. It indicates practical ways of reaching a settlement—that is, by convening an international peace conference with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as the Soviet Union and the United States. The participants in the conference could include also some other States of the Middle East and adjacent areas which could make a positive contribution to the solution of the Middle East problem. Apart from the composition of the conference, the Soviet proposals embrace other aspects of practical organization and the actual work of the conference.

123. The new Soviet initiative is fully in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations and with United Nations decisions on the Middle East and the Palestinian problem. It is very close to the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine held in 1983.[10] Finally—and I want to highlight this point particularly—it takes fully into account the principles embodied in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.[5]

124. In conclusion, I would like to recall the words uttered from this rostrum by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, on 27 September 1984:

> "The Soviet Union has recently put forward a proposal on the principles of a Middle East settlement. That proposal is well known and has evoked a broad response. We call upon all parties to the conflict to act with sober-minded regard for each other's legitimate rights and interests, and upon all other States to facilitate the search for a just settlement in the Middle East." [*10th meeting, para. 159.*]

125. For its part, the Soviet Union reaffirms its readiness to co-operate with all those who want to see a constructive solution to the Middle East problems and the establishment of the true, just and lasting peace so long awaited by the peoples of the Middle East.

126. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community. The Ten remain deeply preoccupied by the serious situation in the Middle East. They are particularly concerned at the lack of progress towards settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the continuance of the war between Iran and Iraq and the continuing violence and tension in Lebanon. Each of these problems is a matter of serious concern in itself and each has serious repercussions for international peace and stability.

127. The Ten have long advocated the need for negotiated solutions to these problems. They therefore particularly welcome the talks which have recently got under way in Naqoura. They commend the Secretary-General for his efforts in promoting these talks. The Ten hope that they will soon result in an agreement facilitating the early withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, the restoration of Lebanese authority and the re-establishment of peace and security in the area. The Ten consider that the continuing Israeli occupation of a substantial part of Lebanon causes a great deal of human suffering and economic disruption. In the view of the Ten, Israel should withdraw its troops in accordance with the call of the Security Council, and other foreign forces on Lebanese soil whose presence is not authorized by the Government should also be withdrawn. The Ten,

some of whom contribute to observer and peace-keeping operations in Lebanon, reaffirm their willingness to assist that country towards peace and normality.

128. The Ten regard the progress which has been made towards reconciliation in Lebanon under the present Government as encouraging and worthy of support. Violence nevertheless continues to flare up and fundamental problems remain to be addressed if the goal of an independent sovereign country enjoying territorial integrity, which has been affirmed so many times by the United Nations and endorsed by the Ten, is to be achieved.

129. The Ten have repeatedly expressed their grave concern over the humanitarian situation in Lebanon and stressed the need to adhere strictly to generally recognized humanitarian principles. The European Community and its member States have contributed to humanitarian assistance operations in Lebanon. In their statement adopted at Stuttgart on 19 June 1983,[11] the Ten, meeting as the European Council, reaffirmed their deep concern at the distress of the civilian population and expressed the hope that the appropriate international organizations would be allowed to assist that population without hindrance. They are deeply appreciative of the relief work which has been carried out in Lebanon by different international agencies under the most difficult conditions. They call on all parties to co-operate with the agencies as well as with UNIFIL, which, on an interim basis, has been entrusted by the Security Council with important additional tasks in the humanitarian and administrative fields. They take this opportunity to express their appreciation of the work of UNIFIL in its effort to carry out its mandate and its work to maintain stable conditions and protect the civil population in its area of operations. The Ten welcome the recent decision of the Security Council, in resolution 555 (1984) of 12 October 1984, to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, and they hope that conditions will be created which will soon allow the Force fully to carry out its tasks and play a more effective role.

130. The Ten find it regrettable that there has been so little progress recently in efforts to find a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Fundamental principles for the settlement of this conflict are set out in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The Ten believe that, in essence, such a settlement must further take account of both the right to existence and security of all States in the Middle East, including Israel, and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, with all that this implies. The Ten continue to be deeply conscious of the importance of the solution of the Palestinian problem for the future peace and security of the Middle East. They firmly believe that a just solution of this problem is an essential element of any comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

131. The guidelines laid down by the international community, which must underlie any solution of the Middle East conflict, are well known. In the view of the Ten, what is needed now is movement by the parties concerned, with the support and assistance of the international community, to negotiate a peaceful solution in accordance with these guidelines. A negotiated settlement will require the continuing and independent expression of the will of the Palestinian people: the Ten have repeatedly said that the PLO must be associated with the negotiations. In the Ten's view, furthermore, a process of negotiation presupposes mutual recognition of the existence and the rights of the parties to the conflict. The resolution of the problems between Israel and its neighbours should be based on the principles, widely accepted in the international community, of non-recourse to the use of force and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. For the Ten, this means that, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), Israel must put an end to the territorial occupation it has maintained since the 1967 conflict.

132. For some time now, because of events on both sides and developments elsewhere, there has been a hiatus in attempts to find a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Ten regret this. Each year that passes without a solution makes its achievement more difficult. Attitudes of hostility become more entrenched, and the problems arising from the long occupation become more serious. Outside parties, including the Ten, can play a part in facilitating negotiations and can assist and support constructive steps by the sides. A number of proposals have been set forth, and remain on the table, which could be helpful for a comprehensive settlement, but it cannot be escaped that the parties themselves—Israel, the Arab States and the Palestinians—must sooner or later grasp the nettle and come to terms with each other's existence and legitimate rights. The Ten urge those involved to take steps in this direction. We believe that a start could be made with the renunciation by all parties of the threat or use of force and with the abandonment by Israel of the policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories, contrary to international law.

133. The Ten have had occasion, most recently in their statement to the Special Political Committee on 20 November [*35th meeting*], to express their concern at the situation in the occupied territories. They attach the greatest importance to all matters affecting the rights of the population of the Arab territories that Israel has occupied since 1967. The Ten are deeply concerned, because the Israeli policies in the area have led to mounting tension and continued unrest. They reaffirm their position that the settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, as well as any change in the status and demographic structure of those territories, are illegal under international law. The Ten reaffirm that, until an end is put to the territorial occupation which Israel has maintained since 1967, the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1907[12] and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[6] are applicable to all these territories. Moreover, the Ten reiterate that the Israeli policy concerning East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights is contrary to international law and therefore invalid.

134. The Ten are concerned at the continuation of conflict between Iran and Iraq and the resultant increased tension in the Gulf area. There has been great loss of life on both sides among combatants and the civilian populations. Enormous material damage has been done. Shipping in the Gulf, including traffic to and from States not parties to the conflict, has been subjected to attacks. Of particular concern was the report issued on 26 March of this year by specialists appointed by the Secretary-General,[13] which ascertained that chemical weapons had been used in areas inspected in Iran. The Ten condemn

without qualification any use of chemical weapons and earnestly hope that they will not be used again in this or any other conflict. We call on both sides to comply with the principles and provisions of humanitarian international law in armed conflicts. We have underlined to Iran and Iraq the importance we attach to freedom of navigation and commerce in international waters, and we recall that the Security Council has more than once addressed this question.

135. More positively, the Ten note with satisfaction the undertaking by Iran and Iraq not to attack purely civilian targets. We compliment the Secretary-General on securing this undertaking and on his work and that of the observer teams in maintaining it. A certain willingness to compromise in order to mitigate the sufferings of the civilian population is an encouraging sign. One of the possibilities offered by the United Nations has been realized. The Ten also commend the other humanitarian efforts of the Secretary-General. The Ten urge both sides to extend the process, leading to a general cessation of military activities in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions and the numerous appeals of the international community. Negotiation aimed at finding a peaceful solution, honourable for both sides, could then begin. Many intermediaries have offered their good offices in this area. The Ten hope that these efforts and those of the Secretary-General will be continued and intensified, and they are ready to support them.

136. In conclusion, the Ten are convinced that every effort must be made to grasp all opportunities for making real progress towards peace in the Middle East. While fully realizing the complexity of the issues involved, the Ten reaffirm that problems can and must be solved without recourse to the use of force. They will continue their best efforts in pursuance of that objective.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14009.

[2] *Ibid., Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15265.

[3] *Ibid., Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1983*, document S/15657.

[4] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[5] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[6] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1984*, document S/16732.

[8] *Ibid., Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1983*, document S/15556.

[9] *Israel in Lebanon: Report of the international commission to enquire into reported violations of international law by Israel during its invasion of Lebanon* (London, Ithaca Press, 1983).

[10] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[11] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15867.

[12] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915), p. 100.

[13] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1984*, document S/16433.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

75th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 27 November 1984,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

1. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The international community calls on us today to continue our steadfast and serious search for a settlement of the conflict in the Middle East and to set our sights on a future free from all fanaticism and hegemony. We must cease to enumerate past events from this rostrum and seize the opportunities of moving towards peace.

2. The causes at the heart of the Middle East problem are well known to the international community. There is no need to revert to controversy over well-established facts. Let us rather examine the chances of peace which have eluded us year after year, and realize that our negligence has cost the peoples of the Middle East dearly. It has frustrated their hopes and aspirations and transformed the region from a land of convergence, an area of confluence, into an arena of violence which has forced its peoples to flee.

3. The international community is unanimous today in recognizing that this conflict must be settled by peaceful means, that the peace that is sought must be based on justice and that we should look towards the future.

4. Springing from this international will and fully aware of its national responsibilities, Egypt put forward its historic initiative, which its Minister for Foreign Affairs described as follows in his statement before the General Assembly on 28 September 1984:

> "Egypt . . . was prompted to launch its historic peace initiative in the hope that a just and honourable peace encompassing the whole region might be achieved, a peace that would usher in a new era of coexistence in accordance with the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, the framework for civilized relations between States and people" [*12th meeting, para. 105*].

5. The events which buffeted the Middle East region in 1982 and 1983, both in Lebanon and in the occupied Arab territories, are excellent proof, if proof is needed, that stark force, whatever level it may reach in wantonness and ferociousness, in destruction and massacres, is unable to quell the will for life and the national spirit, nor can it stifle the aspirations of the Palestinian people for their own State and their attachment to their land, Palestine. Whether they live in exile, in the lands of imposed diaspora, or in the occupied territories of the West Bank, Jerusalem and Gaza, the Palestinian people are prompted by undying nationalist motivations; they want to return to their homeland and to recover their legitimate rights.

6. The occupied Arab territories are the scene every day of inexcusable developments which block the path towards the achievement of peace based on justice and obstruct the serious efforts made towards reconciliation and coexistence. This is manifested in the perpetuation of military occupation as a system of government and by the multiplication of economic and population measures aimed at establishing settlements and installing new settlers.

7. The tragic events in Lebanon have unmasked not only the failure of a policy based on militaristic conceptions but have confirmed by bloody experience that the solution of the Middle East problem does not lie in military action but must be based rather on a peaceful political solution, founded on justice, the principles of the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, and the will of the international community, which can no longer ignore the fact that the Palestinian problem is the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

8. Lebanon, in spite of war, violence and occupation, continues to regroup its energies and to unify its ranks, in realization that a unified Lebanon will be a stronger and more lasting Lebanon. Everyone today must respect the will of the Lebanese people and their legitimate authorities that the defiling of their territory must cease and they must be given the chance to achieve reconciliation and to start the reconstruction of their country, so that Lebanon may once again contribute, as it has throughout history, towards the prosperity of the region which will once again become an oasis of security, liberty and learning.

9. Egypt follows closely the role of the United Nations, which is one of the manifestations of the international will in providing assistance to Lebanon with a view to bringing about the withdrawal of the Israeli occupying forces. We support the role played by the Secretary-General. We support the people and Government of Lebanon in their steadfast efforts to attain their just and legitimate objectives.

10. The success of the international and regional efforts made within the framework of the United Nations, guided by its Charter and pertinent resolutions, depends on the will of all the parties concerned, international and regional, to accept the challenge of peace, fully aware of the disastrous nature of any alternative and the critical time element.

11. Egypt's peace proposal is well defined and its objectives are very clear. It is based on the recognition of rights and the fulfilment of commitments. It is also based on the exercise by the Palestinian people of their natural right, in common with all peoples, to self-determination, under their sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*]; their absolute right freely to choose the political system which they deem appropriate, without intervention or coercion; the right of all to existence and security without discrimination or distinction.

12. Egypt, fully aware of the true nature of the relationships which prevail in the Middle East and the dimensions of the Arab-Israeli conflict and after evaluating carefully the present international equilibrium and the historical period in which we live, has responded to all constructive international initiatives, including the United Nations initiative calling for an international peace conference on the Middle East.

13. Egypt has responded to and supports this invitation. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt stated in his address before the General Assembly, "We wonder why such a call should be rejected or ignored. All of us should reflect deeply on the implications of the positive response by the PLO in accepting this initiative." [*Ibid., para. 116.*] This position, as described by the Foreign Minister of Egypt in the General Assembly, "constitutes a great step forward towards peace."

14. Egypt has clearly explained its position concerning the proposal to hold this international conference and this position is reflected in the Secretary-General's report [*A/39/130 and Add.1*].

15. We believe that the methods applied by the United Nations must be borne in mind. In the final analysis, they provide every chance for the major Powers to fulfil their collective responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, as defined in the Charter of the United Nations, and give the regional parties, on an equal footing, the chance to respond to the appeals and challenges of peace in the Middle East. This is the key to peace and stability, so that the human and material potential may be devoted to the attainment of progress and prosperity for the peoples of the region.

16. Egypt believes that Arab security is indivisible, Arab right is indivisible, Arab peace is indivisible. On that premise, Egypt remains determined to pursue a path towards a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement of the Middle East conflict and its core problem, the Palestinian question.

17. An in-depth reading of the Secretary-General's report [*A/39/600*] reveals the care with which it has been drafted; it sheds light on the various aspects of the situation in the Middle East, including the military developments as regards the peace-keeping operations, the situation in the occupied territories, the Palestinian question, in both its political and its humanitarian dimensions, and the search for a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

18. Among the most important aspects of the Secretary-General's report is the serious and precise manner in which he puts forward a political, procedural and organizational framework for breaking the deadlock and paving the way for serious and practical dialogue between the parties concerned, through the Security Council, as the appropriate negotiating body, and the need to make full use of the Security Council as the organ with principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and to exploit its potential fruitfully.

19. As the report makes clear, the Secretary-General's visits with parties concerned in the Middle East, including Egypt, has provided the United Nations with an opportunity to learn the positions of those parties and also emphasized the international commitment to overcome the obstacles in order to revive the dialogue and negotiations, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and its resolutions.

20. The Secretary-General explains how the Arab-Israeli conflict has continued for 37 years, how a vicious circle of destructive wars has accompanied peace efforts, which stem from a consciousness of the danger of continued deadlock, and how all of this affects the future of the region. We share the view of the Secretary-General, expressed in his report, that it is necessary to attain a comprehensive peaceful settlement that meets the following conditions: the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories; respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the region and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from the threat or use of force; and, finally, a just settlement of the Palestinian problem based on recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination. In this context, the question of Jerusalem also remains of primary importance.

21. We fully accept the framework put forward by the Secretary-General for we see in it a practical approach to reaching a comprehensive peaceful settlement.

22. We also applaud the constructive ideas put forward by the Secretary-General to give effect to the international consensus on the necessity of finding a peaceful settlement through negotiations, with the participation of all the parties concerned within the framework of the Security Council as the negotiating organ.

23. There is no doubt that we are in favour of the various elements or conditions of the settlement proposed by the Secretary-General. At the same time, and as recommended by the Secretary-General, we should incorporate the common characteristics of the various initiatives and proposals submitted in previous years.

24. The Secretary-General has summed up the situation in the Middle East in a succinct and effective manner. We hope that all will understand its long-term effects. He states, *inter alia*, that:

> "The history of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East and of the Palestinian question has thus been a long record of missed opportunities punctuated by wars and violence that have only served to complicate the situation further and to create new misery and new obstacles to peace.
>
> "It seems clear to me that none of the parties to this historic and tragic conflict can hope to obtain its maximum demands if there is to be a state of real peace in the region." [*Ibid., paras. 42 and 43.*]

The Secretary-General goes on to say: "In the light of the deep tension in the Middle East and the emergence of new factors in the situation, nothing could be less realistic than to expect the indefinite continuation of the present situation of no peace–no war" [*ibid., para. 49*].

25. The international community continues rightly to uphold the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, a principle that is enshrined in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), as well as in other relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories—from the West Bank, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, Gaza and the Syrian Golan Heights—must be realized.

26. The challenge before Israel today is not one of geography or security, but rather a historic one in which the whole world calls upon Israel to recognize the legitimacy of the independence of Palestine and take the necessary historic decision to live in peace with it as an independent national entity which, like Israel, has rights. Without a response to that challenge, the peace process will fail. The peace and stability of the region are at stake.

27. To conclude, I wish to add that after 37 years of wars and missed opportunities, the Middle East and the Arab-Israeli conflict are on the threshold of change that could give birth to hope or to continued frustration. Let us therefore endeavour to resuscitate hopes for peace based on justice. Let us seize each available opportunity. Let us open the road in the Middle East for the Palestinian people so that they may exercise the right to self-determination and join the family of nations and the international community. As we are about to turn over the pages of the twentieth century, we call anew for a vigorous renewal of the process of a comprehensive peace based on justice. The time has come to change and to look forward to the future.

28. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): A survey of the development of events since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly last year shows, regretfully, that nothing has changed for the better in the region of the Middle East. On the contrary, the situation has deteriorated. Regardless of the documents produced, the decisions taken or the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly or other international bodies, new elements have been added to the existing conflicts and tensions, making the situation even more tense and explosive.

29. The Albanian delegation would like to reiterate at this session as in the past that the source of the grave situation fraught with tensions in the Middle East is the aggressive and annexationist activities of the Israeli Zionists and the hegemonistic policy pursued by the two super-Powers—United States imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. It is the Middle East's oil and geo-strategic position that lie at the foundation of their bitter political, military and economic rivalry. Their clash for hegemony and the consolidation and expansion of their zones of influence has made the situation more turbulent and has turned the Middle East into a permanent hotbed of tension. The super-Powers cannot hide their wicked envy by publicly proclaiming this region as "a zone of their vital interests", for whose defence they do not hesitate to resort to threats, including the use of force. By treating the entire region, which includes various sovereign countries and peoples, as their own preserve, the super-Powers are overtly and arrogantly showing their aggressive nature.

30. It has now become standard behaviour for them to take the position that only the super-Powers can bring a solution to the crisis of the Middle East and that it is only they who can and should have the last word on everything. But today's reality is such that it is very hard for anybody to believe that a solution could come out of American or Soviet plans.

31. The period since the Reagan plan was sensationally proclaimed on 1 September 1982[1] has given the clearest testimony of this. Since that time our delegation has shared the view that that plan did not and never would serve the interests of the Arab peoples, in particular the Palestinian people. The main aim of that plan remains the consolidation of the United States positions and those of its tool, Israeli zionism, in the region. It was exactly during that period, and against the background of that plan, that American imperialism increased its military intervention in the Middle East and the barbaric Israeli act of aggression was launched against Lebanon, where United States Marines were also engaged. Aeroplanes and cannons of the United States Sixth Fleet rained tons of fire and iron on to the unprotected population of Beirut. The United States signed a strategic-alliance agreement with Israel, the main intention of which was to give Israel greater support politically and greater power militarily. To that end, the American imperialists are providing more financial aid so as to enable Israel to buy weapons from American arms manufacturers and those of other countries, which strengthens their military industry.

32. Logically and rightfully one can pose the question: Why does Israel need all this military arsenal, which, as regards its potential, can be compared with that of the largest imperialist Powers? It can easily be understood. It needs it for no other purpose but to consolidate and perpetuate its occupation of Arab lands and, at the same time, to execute other dangerous plans. It is no accident that, just after that strategic-alliance agreement was signed, the Israeli Zionists became even more unrestrained. Their annexationist policy has taken on new dimensions: the process of Israeli colonization of the occupied territories has gone on apace, southern Lebanon is now completely under occupation and the military régime of the Zionists prevails in Lebanese towns and villages. In sum, by so doing Israel has presented the entire world with a *fait accompli* that not only precludes any withdrawal from the occupied Arab lands but, under the pretext of "the security of borders", aims at expanding the occupied territories further.

33. In the situation now prevailing in Lebanon and in the Middle East in general, one can easily see the efforts made by the American imperialists to involve their allies as much as possible in the region's political and military events. By "internationalizing" intervention in the area because of not wanting to be isolated in its military and political aspects, the American imperialists try at the same time to give the impression of an intervention undertaken in common by the West.

34. On the other hand, the Soviet social-imperialists are doing their utmost to exploit the situation created in the region to achieve their own aims, to gain ground and to torpedo to the maximum the American initiatives. Under these circumstances, they proposed the convening of an international conference that would allegedly solve the crisis in the Middle East [*see A/39/368*]. But it is quite clear that the Soviet proposal has nothing new, either in form or in content. Its principal aim is to consolidate the

position of the Soviet Union in the Middle East at the expense of the American imperialists and to secure greater and stronger involvement in the course of all events. That proposal in itself does not contain anything that serves the interests of the Palestinian or other Arab peoples. It is in keeping with the well-known Soviet policy, which has never spared the label of "friendship" with the Arab peoples. But experience has proved that whenever its interests require, the Soviet Union has not hesitated to stab them in the back. The so-called Soviet aid to the Arab peoples and countries is nothing but a means for accomplishing its enslavement intentions.

35. The continuation of the fratricidal war between Iran and Iraq for more than four years now has aggravated the situation in the region. It is the super-Powers that, to promote their expansionist interests, instigated and provoked this war—which is causing heavy losses to the peoples of both countries—and now try to keep it alive.

36. All this hostile activity against the Arab peoples has created numerous difficulties and caused great suffering, in particular for the Palestinian people. Nobody can be indifferent to the brutal genocide being practised against them, which is often characterized by the physical liquidation of people *en masse*. No matter how many years pass, Sabra and Shatila will always remain an indelible black blot of wantonness on Israeli zionism in its bloody crusade against the Palestinian people.

37. The massacred—old men or women, adults or children—the mountains of victims, are and will remain a vivid accusation of the Israeli Zionists. Nothing can justify the deportation of the Palestinian people from their homeland where for thousands of years generations of them have been living. History has hardly known any other such practice of genocide. Nevertheless, such things do not attract the attention at all of those who claim to be champions of the defence of human rights.

38. The Palestinian people have become a target of the imperialist-Zionist policy because the struggle of that people is one of the main obstacles preventing them from accomplishing their plans. The enemies of the Palestinian people would like them to lay down their arms, give up their armed struggle and subject themselves to the tragic fate dictated by the super-Powers and zionism. They have always attempted to sow discord within the Palestinian liberation movement and create antagonism between it and various Arab countries. But the brave and heroic Arab peoples which have been fighting for centuries will never abandon their struggle until they win their legitimate rights. They know how to avoid falling into the traps and the misleading and disruptive plots of the super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as those of Israel. The strengthening of the genuine unity among themselves in order to resist and overcome the united forces of Israel, the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and those in reactionary circles is a necessity in their just struggle. Only resolute, uncompromising struggle based on genuine Arab unity will lead them to victory.

39. The Albanian people and its Government, as always, strongly condemn the criminal actions of the Israeli Zionists against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. They condemn their brutal genocide that knows no bounds, their occupation of southern Lebanon and their annexationist policy as a whole. At the same time, they denounce the conspiratorial policy of the two super-Powers, which have provoked, kept ablaze and adjusted the tension in the Middle East according to their aims and ambitions, even by bargaining with each other in keeping with their interests.

40. The synthesis of our attitude of principle in support of the just cause of the fraternal Arab peoples is to be found in the following extract from *Reflections on the Middle East*,[2] a book written by the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, and published recently:

> "We have defended and will continue to defend the just anti-imperialist cause of the Arab peoples, who have seen, are seeing and will see that small socialist Albania is not afraid of the imperialists and revisionists and that it will always be a sincere and loyal friend of the Arab countries, in good times or bad."

41. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): While unresolved tensions and crises are rampant in various regions of our world today, nowhere but in the Middle East has protracted conflict carried with it such a palpable threat to international peace and security.

42. The Arab-Israeli conflict has remained unresolved for almost 40 years now. The search for durable peace in that volatile region has become locked into a most depressing pattern—moving from one crisis to the next, from war to frenzied peace initiative, to war and back again—without ever budging significantly from the impasse that has persisted, or has been allowed to persist, over this problem. In the meantime, far from yielding new opportunities towards a solution, continued delay has brought added complications and even more dangerous dimensions to the conflict.

43. The United Nations, which since its inception has been seized of this problem in all its multifarious aspects, cannot, however, be held accountable for this stalemate. Over the years, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted scores of resolutions and decisions in efforts to create the necessary conditions for and to point the way to a just and lasting peace in the region. But they have all met with Israel's brazen intransigence and utter disregard of international norms of civilized behaviour.

44. Encouraged by the almost unquestioning support extended to it by its powerful friends and protectors, Israel has habitually flouted the cardinal principles and rulings of the United Nations. As events during the past year have again shown, Israel persists in its efforts to impose on the region by force of arms its own aggressive and expansionist designs, in arrogant defiance of world censure.

45. Two and a half years after the brutal invasion of Lebanon, Israeli troops are still occupying parts of Lebanese territory. Indeed, their prolonged illegal presence in southern Lebanon all but confirms the view that Israel's ultimate intent has all along been the *de facto* partition of that country. In the light of those facts, the stated readiness of the Tel Aviv régime to negotiate the withdrawal of its occupation forces under the aegis of the United Nations cannot be accepted at its face value. My delegation for one can be persuaded of Israel's good faith in this matter only if and when it complies with Security Council and General Assembly demands.

46. At the same time, my delegation is greatly encouraged that after an arduous process of national reconciliation Lebanon has emerged with a new Government of National Unity. Indonesia extends its full support to the Lebanese Government and people in their efforts further to consolidate national resilience and to restore its territorial integrity by achieving the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces to internationally recognized boundaries.

47. The past year has also witnessed the continued colonization and Judaization of the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, which are aimed at changing their legal status and demographic composition. Israel's pursuit of its infamous settlements policy is unabated and, indeed, has accelerated. The Palestinian Arabs in the West Bank, as in all territories under Israeli rule, have had to endure ever harsher measures and practices designed to terrorize and intimidate them into leaving their ancestral homeland. And their most elementary human rights and civil liberties continue to be ruthlessly trampled upon. It is the intensification of this systematic policy of oppression and repression which constitutes the bitter reality in the Middle East today and has rendered the resolution of the conflict immeasurably more difficult.

48. It is clear that the onus of responsibility for this state of affairs falls squarely on Israel, whose policies and actions have always been the root cause of aggravated tension and conflict in the region. It is equally clear, however, that resort to armed might and policies based on sheer power calculations have brought neither greater security to Israel nor peace to the Middle East.

49. By Indonesia and the overwhelming majority of mankind, the essence of the Middle East problem is rightly perceived as one of justice: justice in ensuring the exercise of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independent statehood in Palestine; justice in effecting Israel's total withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem; justice in safeguarding the basic need of the States in the region to live in peace within secure boundaries, free from aggression and foreign occupation; and, finally, justice in securing the right of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing in all efforts and negotiations towards finding a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. Those are indeed the essential elements on which a durable and comprehensive peace should be based.

50. It is most distressing to observe, however, that to the major Powers the Arab-Israeli conflict appears to be primarily viewed in terms of a global power struggle, for which strategic alliances need to be forged and in which armed confrontation cannot be ruled out. If this is to be the predominant perception in our pursuit of a solution in the Middle East, the chances of world-wide conflagration could conceivably become an imminent reality.

51. My Government, therefore, has always been acutely aware of the need for all of us to persevere in the only sensible path towards a peaceful and comprehensive settlement, which is through a process of negotiation involving the one international machinery which we have collectively created and designed for this very purpose: the United Nations.

Mr. Helgason (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

52. At this juncture, my delegation would like to recall that the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, unanimously agreed to call for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, a call subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C.

53. Indonesia's support for the proposed conference was premised on the conviction that such a conference would indeed serve as a viable and effective negotiating framework within which the various interrelated aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, as well as the multiplicity of contending interests inherent in them, could equitably and comprehensively be addressed. It would furthermore provide a forum in which all the parties concerned would participate on an equal footing, including the PLO.

54. Resolution 38/58 C also requested the Secretary-General to undertake consultations and to seek the views of the members of the Security Council and of Governments directly interested in the Arab-Israeli conflict on the holding of the conference. The Secretary-General has reported to us the results of his efforts [*see A/39/130 and Add.1*]. Although a large majority of those consulted fully endorsed the convening of the peace conference, with some advancing significant proposals on various aspects, certain Governments responded negatively. My delegation, therefore, deeply regrets that on the basis of those responses the Secretary-General in his subsequent report has had to conclude that: "the conditions required for convening the proposed conference with any chance of success are not met at the present time" [*A/39/600, para. 40*].

55. While Indonesia is under no illusion that the objective of a peace conference could be easily realized, we remain convinced that it is only through patient diplomacy and serious negotiations that a peaceful and lasting settlement to the Middle East problem can be attained. There is also no question but that any progress and success on this score will essentially depend on the political will and the support of the major Powers, particularly the two super-Powers. Hence, we fully agree with the Secretary-General that the United Nations should make another determined effort to find the means by which we can move forward to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We in Indonesia believe, as he does, that given the urgent need to break the present deadlock, it should still be possible to devise, within the overall framework of the international peace conference, a negotiating process or structure acceptable to all the parties concerned, for the alternative can only be an inexorable slide towards yet another, even more destructive, cycle of violence and war, with disastrous consequences not only for the region but for the world as a whole.

56. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): For many long years, the situation in the Middle East has been the centre of world attention. During all of those years, the United Nations has adopted a large number of resolutions and decisions for the purpose of achieving a just and peaceful solution to the conflict, but they have yet to be applied and the situation remains extremely tense and explosive. The crisis is perpetuating itself and

could at any moment be converted into an armed conflict with unforeseeable consequences.

57. There is no shadow of doubt, for the world as a whole, that the crisis in the Middle East is a direct result of the expansionist policy of the State of Israel. From 1948 up to the present time, it has waged five wars of aggression, and since 1967 it has been occupying the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and the south of Lebanon. It is pursuing a policy of colonization in the occupied territories. It is extending the network of its military settlements by constantly increasing the number of settlers. There is confirmation of its designs to increase the number of those settlers to 1.4 million. From the very rostrum of the Knesset, calls were made by chauvinist elements dreaming of Greater Israel for the complete annexation of the occupied territories.

58. During the last few years, Tel Aviv has added a new page of violence to the annals of the conflict of the Middle East. An Israeli army, 100,000 men strong, invaded Lebanon, sowing death and devastation on its way. From the beginning, the designs behind that aggression were no secret to anyone. They were to seize a new strategic stronghold, to crush the patriotic national forces and the Palestinian resistance. In the operation in Lebanon, Tel Aviv saw among other things a possibility of dealing a crushing blow to the Syrian Arab Republic whose anti-imperialist positions had more than once foiled its military designs. And it is precisely its adventure in Lebanon which has covered it with opprobrium: the Israeli military machine organized the massacre of hundreds of thousands of innocent women, children and the elderly in the camps of Sabra and Shatila.

59. Israel's aggression has caused indescribable suffering and hardship to the people and the countries of the Arab world. But the principal victims of its ambitions of conquest are the Arab people of Palestine.

60. For decades, millions of Palestinians have been living expelled from their homes and have been denied the sacred right to own their own homeland. In the occupied lands, their national rights are cruelly trampled underfoot. They are the object of gross exploitation and of police lawlessness and national discrimination. The whole of Israel's military machine is subordinated at present to the goal of destroying the Palestinian movement of national liberation and to erase the question of Palestine from the agenda of world problems. All this is done in flagrant violation of the principles of international law and of the decisions of the United Nations, in defiance of international public opinion, which has been expressed on so many occasions.

61. As for the causes of the serious situation in the Middle East, it is clear, even to an uninformed person, that it is solely through the military, financial, political and diplomatic assistance of the United States that Israel has been capable of carrying out its major piratical operations and has ignored, with so much defiance, the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the appeals of the world Organization. For its part, the United States sees Israel as the principal instrument of its long-term strategy in this region, a strategy which aims at imposing its political and military domination upon the crossroads of the three continents in the eastern hemisphere, as well as its control over the natural wealth of the Arab world, first and foremost, its oil resources.

62. The anti-Arab nature of this alliance between Israel and the United States has been displayed in the last few years in all clarity. It has based its tactic on the imposition of separate agreements with Arab States, in accordance with the classic principle of divide and rule. This was ultimately the meaning of the ingloriously famous Camp David accords, which have only led to the escalation of the crisis, and also the meaning of their latter-day variations. The humiliating agreement reached between Israel and Lebanon in May 1983, which was another desperate attempt to impose this system, in practice was designed to achieve the partition of Lebanon and the transformation of that country into a foreign protectorate and into a forward position for attacks against the neighbouring Arab countries.

63. The events which followed illustrated the limited possibilities of the new colonizers. Signed in the shadow of the cannon, this shameful document was revoked, thanks to the fierce opposition of Lebanese patriots and progressive Arab States. It has been demonstrated once again that it is difficult today to force a people to their knees by bayonets or by the threat of reprisal expeditions, or by armadas.

64. The most recent developments show that the urgency for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem remains as great as ever. The analysis of its history reveals that its various components are closely linked and interdependent. The path of partial solutions and of selective approaches is filled with dangers and leads to an impasse. To try to strengthen the security of someone by ignoring the legitimate rights of others is only a step towards the perpetuation and the aggravation of the conflict.

65. In view of the gravity of the present international situation, the world community is quite right in looking for a solution to the problem of the Middle East which would take into account all of its aspects: the vital interests of the peoples of the region, as well as strengthened international peace and security. This is the approach of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, which is based upon the principle of the inadmissibility of the annexation of foreign territories by means of aggression. This steadfast position of the socialist countries was expressed in the Political Declaration adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held at Prague on 4 and 5 January 1983,[3] as well as in numerous other initiatives and proposals that are well known by now.

66. The Soviet proposal of 29 July 1984 [*A/39/368*], which offers bench-marks for a comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem and opens a clear prospect for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region, has been welcomed with great interest. It was qualified as a positive undertaking by numerous Heads of State and political leaders.

67. The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully shares the idea that the first and irreplaceable condition for the solution of the problem remains the liberation of all the occupied Arab territories held from 1967 to this day and the elimination of Israeli settlements established in those territories. With this, it is necessary to put into practice guarantees for the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of its own State.

This will have decisive importance for the normalization of the situation in the Middle East. The possibility should also be given to Palestine refugees to return to their homes or else to be compensated for their property.

68. The settlement of the problem should guarantee, in practice, the right of all the peoples to live and develop in independence and security, with due respect for absolute reciprocity. The only real way that could lead to this goal is the cessation of the state of war between the Arab countries and Israel and the undertaking by all the parties to the conflict, Israel and the State of Palestine, to respect the independence, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the other and to resolve their difficulties by peaceful means.

69. An important instrument of stabilization for such a settlement would be the adoption of international guarantees for the peaceful settlement; and the role of guarantor could then be entrusted to the permanent members of the Security Council or to the Security Council as a whole.

70. The Soviet initiative, as we see it, has the merit of putting into focus the idea of an international conference on the Middle East, which was launched some time ago by the socialist countries and which has broad international support. The Bulgarian delegation has constantly expressed the certainty that such a conference, under the aegis of the United Nations, offers the most appropriate machinery for the solution of the complex problems of the Middle East. It is natural that at such a conference we should have the participation of all the Arab States having common frontiers with Israel. This means Syria, Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon and, of course, Israel, as well as the PLO, as the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. It would also be normal for the Soviet Union and the United States to take part in such a conference in view of the fact that, historically, they have been playing an important role in the affairs of the region and that they were co-chairmen of the previous conference on the Middle East. It is also logical to provide for the participation, by common agreement, of certain other States capable of favourably influencing the solution of the problems under discussion.

71. I should like to point out that the constructive positions of the socialist States, including those of the Soviet proposal of 29 July 1984, are consistent with the principles embodied in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[4] as they are consistent with the well-known resolutions of the United Nations on the problems of the Middle East.

72. To conclude, I should like to emphasize that the People's Republic of Bulgaria has always followed with interest and sincere preoccupation the development of the situation in this region. My country feels the legitimate aspirations of the Arab people as being very close and understandable and fully supports their heroic struggle for freedom, independence and social progress.

73. The vital interests of the peoples of the Middle East, like the interests of peace and security throughout the world, require that the United Nations and all its Member States exert maximum effort so that an early end might be put to the hotbed of tensions in this long-suffering part of the world. As far as Bulgaria is concerned, it will continue in the future to work in favour of a peaceful, just and lasting settlement of the conflict of the Middle East.

74. Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): In his report on the situation in the Middle East, the Secretary-General observed that:

> "The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East has followed a pattern that has become all too familiar. Each of the five destructive and inconclusive wars has been followed by a new peace effort, spurred by the renewed awareness of the dangers of continued stalemate. On each occasion proposals were put forward and in some cases partial agreement reached, but the peace effort soon became deadlocked because of the intransigence of one party or another. In time, the sense of urgency was lost and a deadlock was once again allowed to persist until the next major crisis." [*A/39/600, para. 35.*]

75. No other issue in contemporary history has been discussed and deliberated on so extensively, yet the problem remains unresolved, and it continues to threaten international peace and security, despite the nearly unanimous appeals of the international community. On the contrary, the situation has steadily deteriorated, even in the course of the past year, and this has further aggravated the already explosive situation in the region. What we are faced with is a totally unacceptable situation created by the continued Israeli policy of aggression, occupation and expansionism. The people in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories have been subjected to the worst forms of harassment and persecution. Israel's policies and recent actions have made it abundantly clear that it is interested only in heightening tension in the region and is determined to frustrate any international move to resolve the Middle East problem peacefully.

76. The present explosive situation in the Middle East is a direct consequence of a historic injustice, when an alien people was virtually imposed upon the Arab world through the creation of Israel. This newly created State, which received huge economic, political and military aid from its allies and friends, adopted from the outset an aggressive and hostile policy against its Arab neighbours. In violation of all the canons of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, Israel—pleading so-called self-defence—carried out a series of acts of aggression and occupied huge Arab territories. Despite repeated calls by the General Assembly and the Security Council, Israel has refused to vacate the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. All the efforts of the United Nations to bring justice to the suffering Palestinian and Arab people have been arrogantly and deliberately rejected by Israel, which has openly flouted the voice of the international community.

77. In the face of the growing universal consensus in favour of the Arab and Palestinian cause, Israel has of late further intensified its policy of aggression, illegal settlements and annexation. The Israeli attempts to annex and change the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights have been unequivocally condemned by the international community and declared null and void. Then, in 1982, Israel invaded Lebanon and, despite resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, has continued to occupy a major part of that country.

78. In pursuance of its policy of State terrorism, Israel has also stepped up its barbarity and repression in the occupied territories as part of its ruthless design to liquidate the Palestinian people and its sole legitimate representative, the PLO. Thousands of innocent men, women and children have been massacred, but the heroic Palestinian people have demonstrated that they cannot and will not be subjugated by violence. The Palestinian youths who laid down their lives only last week proved once again that the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people cannot be denied them. Similarly, recent developments have demonstrated that their sole legitimate representative, the PLO, cannot be silenced.

79. It is now universally recognized that the question of Palestine is at the core of the problem of the Middle East and that, consequently, it is not possible to envisage a settlement of the problems in the Middle East unless the legitimate and inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people are fully restored. Bangladesh has reiterated in the past its firm conviction that any meaningful effort to bring peace in the region must be based on a comprehensive solution of the problem.

80. It was in this context that the Bangladesh Adviser for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury, in his statement to the General Assembly on 1 October, summed up our position on this issue when he stated:

> "The tragedy of Palestine is the tragedy of our times. No other issue in recent times has evoked so much attention and concern as the plight of the Palestinians. For more than three decades, the international community has witnessed the sufferings and anguish of the Palestinian people, who were forcibly uprooted from their hearths and homes. It is now universally recognized that the heart of the problem is the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish a State of their own with Jerusalem as its capital. It is regrettable that Israel continues to flout the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations and persists in its illegal occupation of Arab and Palestine territories, including the Holy City of Al Quds al-Sharif. The position of Bangladesh on this question has always been firm and consistent and we have always extended our unstinted support to our Palestinian brothers in their struggle for the restoration of their inalienable right to self-determination under the leadership of the PLO, their sole and legitimate representative. We condemn the continued Israeli occupation of Arab and Palestinian territories and the establishment of settlements in the occupied lands. We are convinced that the situation demands a comprehensive settlement of the problem which must be based on total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Palestinian and Arab territories and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. We are also convinced that the participation of the PLO, on an equal footing with all other parties, in the peace process is indispensable. It is in this context that we extended our full support to the Arab peace plan as a sound basis for establishing peace in the region. We commend the Secretary-General for his sincere endeavours and for his untiring efforts to restore peace in the region." [*15th meeting, para. 129.*]

81. The developments in the Middle East during the last nearly four decades have demonstrated beyond any shadow of a doubt that the complex problem of the Middle East cannot be solved by a few countries—or, in other words, by a major Power and its allies. Such moves are bound to be heavily tilted in their own favour, serving only their narrow national interests, and to the detriment of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. What is clearly needed is an international effort under the aegis of the United Nations to ensure that the interests and rights of all the parties concerned are met and respected in a fully impartial and rational manner, with a view to evolving a just, viable and lasting settlement of the problem.

82. It is in this context that the proposed international peace conference on the Middle East assumes particular importance. Such a conference, it is unnecessary to emphasize, will have to go through a process initially with the parties directly involved, including the PLO and the major Powers, particularly the United States and the Soviet Union. Gradually the process should be widened to include all the parties that are interested in the region and, finally, the entire international community. What is needed to start this process is the necessary political will, particularly on the part of the major Powers which are in a position to influence developments in the region. The situation in the Middle East has already reached an explosive stage and any further delay in starting the peace process might trigger off a totally unmanageable crisis, making it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to restore peace in the region.

83. Bangladesh has therefore consistently supported the call for the early convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. We consider it vital that all parties involved in the current conflict in the Middle East should participate in the conference, including the PLO, as well as the United States and the Soviet Union. We therefore fully appreciate the efforts of the Secretary-General to that end. We are somewhat disappointed to note from his latest report that "the conditions required for convening the proposed conference with any chance of success are not met at the present time" [*A/39/600, para. 40*]. However, we fully share his assessment that:

> "What is now needed, it seems to me, is a framework for negotiations and an umbrella under which the necessary contacts could develop according to the demands of the problems that were being considered. It is this kind of framework or auspices that I believe could most usefully serve the needs of all the parties to the Middle East conflict." [*Ibid., para. 47.*]

We are greatly appreciative of the persistent efforts of the Secretary-General, who is seeking a way to get the peace process moving.

84. On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, a renewed international effort should be undertaken to start the peace process in the region. The Arab peace plan, which was adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[4] and which my delegation fully supports as a sound basis for the restoration of peace in the Middle East, and other plans which have been submitted from various quarters are already before the international community. Let us then take a decisive course of action here at this session to initiate the peace process. The purposes and princi-

ples of the Charter of the United Nations are as valid today as they were at the time of the founding of the Organization. The most fitting sign of respect that we can show this great world body on the eve of this historic anniversary is a determined effort to restore peace in the Middle East on the basis of the sacred principles enshrined in its Charter.

85. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): It has become customary, after each Israeli act of aggression against Arab States, for peace initiatives to be put forward in an attempt to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict. It has also become customary for Israel, after each of its misdeeds, to adopt an intransigent position, consisting in a challenge to the international rule of law and a denial of the rights of others. This observation, which unfortunately has been proved correct repeatedly by the adventurism of successive Israeli leaders, was shown to be valid once again following the Israeli aggression in Lebanon.

86. For the first time in the history of the conflict, four peace plans emerged and gave rise to hope in an international community sorely tried by the persistence of a hotbed of tension that seriously threatens international peace and security. As soon as their authors announced these initiatives, they were rejected by Israeli leaders very little inclined to take account of the concerns of the international community.

87. More than two years after the invasion of Lebanon, these various peace initiatives remain pious wishes, despite the protracted involvement of the occupation forces and the vicissitudes that led to the departure of Mr. Begin and the postponement of Israeli designs in Lebanon.

88. Tunisia, which is dedicated to the rule of international law and the role that the United Nations is destined to play in this conflict, deeply regrets the failure that we see today as a result of the inflexible attitude of the Israeli leaders.

89. Israel stubbornly rejects the idea of the establishment of a Palestinian State, despite the international consensus. Israel is making ever more clear its intention to annex the occupied territories by force of arms. Israel continues to expropriate and confiscate Palestinian and Arab lands and to arrest and expel Palestinians. Israel is feverishly establishing settlements in the occupied territories with the aim of crushing Arab towns and villages and forcing their inhabitants to leave. In the name of a dubious concept of security, Israel bombs the Iraqi nuclear reactor, transforms southern Lebanon into a forward observation post and tightens its grip on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Worse still, Israel keeps alive a doubt as to its true borders in the hope of realizing what it terms "Eretz Yisrael".

90. In the more than 35 years since the establishment of Israel, the international community has had ample time to observe that that country is a danger to peace and that the description "peace-loving State" conferred upon it in General Assembly resolution 273 (III), of 11 May 1949, was all the more unjustifiable in that, between 29 November 1947 and 11 May 1949, Israeli troops, despite the efforts of the United Nations, had already seized territories in the area allocated to the Arabs of Palestine.

91. Count Bernadotte rightly stated that "The United Nations has neglected the vital duty of applying to this State [Israel] the régime of an international mandate to determine the functional system of the State and to assess the competence of its public authorities and its conduct in inter-State society."

92. It is clear today that this kind of omission, in addition to the circumstances and pressures which led to the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 and which were touched upon in the memoirs of former United States President Harry Truman, is at the root of the explosive situation in the Middle East and notably of the grave injustice committed against the Palestinian people.

93. It is not our intention to reassess the historical background of both the Israeli-Palestinian and the Arab-Israeli problem but only to indicate that the policy of *fait accompli* which underlies the Zionist ideology was unfortunately tried out successfully as soon as it was announced that Israel was going to be created.

94. Israeli expansionism consists of a series of *faits accomplis*, the latest of which is the invasion of Lebanon. Virtually any pretext can be adduced so long as the objective remains clear—that is the deplorable attitude adopted by the Israeli leaders when they face the Arab-Israeli problem.

95. The settlements policy promoted by the leaders of Israel is of the greatest concern to us. If the Governments that have succeeded each other since 1967 have encouraged and promoted settlements in the occupied territories, the Begin Government, in particular, did not fail to make use of Talmudic arguments to affirm that the West Bank belongs to what it calls the "Land of Israel". The objective was to have 100,000 settlers in the West Bank as rapidly as possible. That figure, in its view, would be a "critical mass" which would not allow any subsequent Israeli Government to agree to a withdrawal from the occupied territories.

96. This plan to Judaize the occupied territories, or at least engulf the Palestinian population by politically, economically and even numerically stifling Arab villages and towns, is based on arguments of security, the myth of an alleged Arab danger lurking against Israel and many other considerations running counter to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

97. Israeli leaders emphasize the fundamental strategic role of the settlements. In January 1977, Yitzhak Rabin, then Prime Minister of Israel, stated that the settlements strengthened the security of Israel and provided a solid foundation for its argument demanding peace with defensible borders. Yigal Allon was of the view that the settlements were set up in strategically important areas along the existing borders and in the proximity of areas that could become borders in the future.

98. The process that Israeli leaders view as irreversible was accelerated in the wake of the invasion of Lebanon and of the peace proposals put forward by President Reagan on 1 September 1982.[1] At present we are seeing the acceleration of Judaization of the Holy City of Al-Quds and of Al-Khalil and other Palestinian towns, pursuant to a plan which is no doubt intended gradually to remove the Palestinian inhabitants and put Jewish families in their place.

99. The establishment of Jewish militias which sow terror among the Palestinian inhabitants is obviously favourable to this policy of gradually absorbing the Arab occupied territories.

100. The Kach movement of Meir Kahane, an expert on violence against the Palestinians in the occupied territories, has firmly established this deplorable racist tendency which the Israeli leaders are trying in vain to defend. In his book, *The Case of Israel: A Study of Political Zionism*,[5] Roger Garaudy feels that "the racism of political zionism is a perfectly coherent system on which all the legislation and practices of the State of Israel are based".

101. Israeli practice in the occupied Arab territories at present consists of tightening the vice around Arab habitation centres, increasing the density of already existing settlements, and establishing others so that, by 1987, 175 settlements will be established in which a quarter of a million Jews will take up residence.

102. The plan prepared by Matityahu Drobles on the settling of the West Bank, as well as documents of the World Zionist Organization on the expansion of settlement areas, clearly show the annexationist intentions of the Israeli leaders in defiance of relevant international laws and conventions.

103. Despite the Israeli Government's refusal to admit that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[6] applies to the occupied territories, on the pretext that before the 1967 war Jordan and Egypt did not exercise legitimate sovereignty respectively over the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, its applicability was affirmed by the International Committee of the Red Cross, by the United Nations and by most Governments of the world.

104. Leonard Meeker, an attorney and former legal counsel of the United States State Department, expressed the following view on the question of the establishment of settlements in the Arab territories:

> "The establishment of Israeli settlers in these areas, without any agreement to that effect, is incompatible with the right to self-determination of those areas and, consequently, considerably complicates the demographic situation. As has already been stated, this kind of action is incompatible with the obligations assumed by Israel as a military occupying Power in the territories in question."

105. Defying all rules of international law and relevant conventions, Israel has profoundly changed the demographic character of the occupied territories by resorting to expropriation and the confiscation of Arab lands and severely punishing the Palestinians by applying a vast array of coercive measures, turning the Arab populations of the territories into undesirables in the eyes of the Israelis.

106. The Ben Porat project, relating to the resettlement of Palestinian refugees, constitutes another link in the chain of criminal actions against Palestinians designed to minimize their struggle and to erase every trace testifying to the injustice they have suffered.

107. All this, we are told, is done in the name of the security of Israel, whether it be Lebanon, the Golan Heights, the West Bank or the Gaza Strip. The aggression against Lebanon is particularly puzzling. We cannot go along with the fact that a military Power such as Israel should occupy a third of Lebanon, a small country which, for that matter, represents no threat to Israel and whose southern borders were defined by the General Armistice Agreement between Lebanon and Israel, of 23 March 1949.[7]

108. Furthermore, we are shocked by the Israeli authorities systematically resorting to practices prohibited by the Geneva Convention and the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907.[8]

109. Those authorities, which constantly defy the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council and the General Assembly, are today attempting to drive away the inhabitants of southern Lebanon by force of arms or by destroying their means of livelihood. Having failed to impose upon the Lebanese Government an unjust, unequal agreement, Israel is seeking by all means to cut off southern Lebanon from the rest of the country and establish a zone of influence serving its own expansionist designs.

110. These realities are obvious to everyone today. They cannot be concealed by the pretexts the occupying Power sometimes uses to maintain its hold on the occupied territories.

111. Above all, the argument regarding security is to our mind fallacious, because no matter how far one pushes one's borders one always finds oneself next to neighbours that one has not chosen and whose sovereign and inalienable rights one must recognize and respect.

112. We believe that the notion of sure borders defended by Israel will remain a mirage, a delusion, so long as the problem of the Middle East is not solved at its root and the Palestinian people have not exercised their right to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of their own State.

113. Ariel Sharon, one of those directly responsible for the genocide at Sabra and Shatila, spoke of Israel's interests in the following terms:

> "Israel's interests are not confined to the Arab countries of the Middle East, of the Mediterranean or of the Red Sea. For reasons of security, in the 1980s Israel's interests will extend to countries such as Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, areas such as the Persian Gulf and Africa, notably those of northern and central Africa."

That is what Mr. Sharon said. It is a very specific vision of what the world around Israel should be, a frightening vision, not just for Lebanon and other Arab neighbours, but for other countries considerably further away.

114. Israel is seeking supremacy in the Middle East region and is harbouring excessively ambitious designs which were reported in an article in the review *Kivunim*, published by the World Zionist Organization in Jerusalem in February 1982, issue No. 14.

115. The article deals with Israel's strategy for the 1980s. The disintegration of neighbouring Arab States is one of the priorities for the coming years. The reconquest of the Sinai, the dismemberment of Egypt, of Lebanon, of Syria, of Iraq and other Arab countries further removed will, according to the World Zionist Organization, be brought about through ethnic or religious conflicts in which Israel will play a key role.

116. The Palestinians of the occupied territories, which the *Kivunim* calls Arab-Palestinians:

> "must understand that they cannot have any homeland except in Jordan . . . and cannot know security except by recognizing Jewish sovereignty from the sea to the Jordan . . . It is not possible, at the threshold of the nuclear era, to accept that three fourths of the Jewish population should be

concentrated on an over-populated and naturally exposed seacoast, and the dispersal of this population is a major imperative of our internal policy; Judea, Samaria and Galilee are the sole guarantees of our national survival, and if we do not become a majority in the mountainous regions we may suffer the same fate as the Crusaders who lost this country."

117. The World Zionist Organization nourishes an ambition to bring about what it terms "the re-equilibrium of the region from a demographic, strategic and economic standpoint, which would require control over the water resources of the region from Beersheba to Upper Galilee".

118. The appropriation of water resources in the region has led to disputes with neighbouring Arab countries since the creation of Israel. Today, again, the quest by Israel for new sources of water poses a grave threat to Jordan and Lebanon, whose rivers are sought by Israel.

119. Perhaps here we should recall that at the Paris Conference of 1919 the leaders of the World Zionist Organization called for the establishment of a Jewish National Home incorporating the rivers of southern Lebanon and both banks of the Jordan.

120. The policy followed by Israel since its creation, both *vis-à-vis* the Palestinian people and *vis-à-vis* the countries of the Middle East, has continuously increased tension in a region that has seen the birth and development of three religions that appeal to the minds and hearts of man, to the brotherhood of man and love for one's neighbour.

121. By its obstinacy and intransigence, Israel has brought about the failure of every attempt at a solution over the last 36 years and has blocked implementation of resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. In so doing it hoped to reach a point of no return in the implementation of its plans for colonization, Judaization and expansionism. But it has pretended to ignore the danger that it is bringing to the region, to the situation in the Mediterranean and to international peace.

122. Of course, Israel has always lived in fear that peace might break out. The military potential it has available has so far enabled it to win the battles; but does it hope to carry away nothing but victories?

123. What will Israel do 10, 20 or 30 years from now when the Arab countries will exceed 200 million inhabitants and will have developed their scientific and technological bases? What will Israel do then? Will it always be resolved to confront its neighbours on the field of battle? Will it still refuse to recognize the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and to live in peace? Is it forgetting that without the aid of its powerful allies it would have lost the war of 1973, a war that destroyed the myth of invincibility that it had used as its shield?

124. Israel's allies, to our way of thinking, should have a broader view of the region's future and abandon their support of what is increasingly an unjust cause which condemns millions of Palestinians to wander homeless and constantly threatens the territorial integrity of neighbouring countries. And what will Israel do when its powerful allies decide strictly to respect international law, the resolutions of the United Nations and the promptings of equity, and withdraw their support?

125. There is still time to move towards peace, a peace that should begin with the solution of the Palestinian problem, which is at the core of the situation in the Middle East and involves the whole region.

126. There is still time once again to give hope to the Palestinian people, who are firmly resolved to pursue, under the leadership of the PLO, their struggle for dignity and liberty.

127. Palestinians and Arabs, meeting at Fez in September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, unanimously adopted a peace plan[4] based on two clearly defined principles: first, the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories, including Al-Quds, and recognition of the imprescriptible rights of the Palestinians to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of their independent State; and secondly, recognition of the rights of all States of the region to peace under the guarantee of the Security Council.

128. The Fez plan is based on the rule of international law; it emanates from a realistic assessment of the Middle East situation reflecting the various peace initiatives put forward. Its merit arises also from the fact that it presents specific and concrete modalities for implementation.

129. Israel, as usual, rejected this plan. It also rejected the Reagan plan of 1 September 1982[1] as soon as it was announced. The same fate befell the Brezhnev plan, put forward on 15 September 1982,[9] and the French-Egyptian plan, embodied in a draft resolution submitted to the Security Council on 28 July 1982.[10]

130. Israel seems to believe only in the virtue of separate plans imposed by force, which, unfortunately, have contributed only to enhancement of the tensions and doubts in the region.

131. The Israelis know today how much they have been misled. The financial, economic, political and spiritual crisis resulting from this lunge forward by their governments tells a great deal about the failure of the political line chosen by Israel. Therein lie the true problems facing the Middle East, problems which the Israeli representative failed to touch upon in his statement yesterday [*72nd meeting*].

132. The perfidious, laughable and pointless diversion which he touched on yesterday could not disguise the reality of which his country is the cause in the Middle East, a tragic reality consisting in massacres of Palestinians, denial of their fundamental rights and plots against the Arab countries, threatened by an expansionist, colonialist, aggressive Israel, whose principal objective is to extend its supremacy over the entire region.

133. In addressing a new appeal to the international community to redouble its efforts to bring about a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, Tunisia wishes to pay tribute to the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East.

134. If we all agree to make efforts in good faith to ensure that it is convened, that conference, we are confident, will put an end to the vicious circle of violence that continues to beset that region and will contribute to the speedy resumption of the process towards peace based on law and justice.

135. Mr. ALIAS (Malaysia): The situation in the Middle East has been on the agenda of the General

Assembly for many years now, almost since the birth of the United Nations. Yet, despite numerous attempts to find a solution and a host of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, we are no nearer a solution. Ironically, many elements contained in the various resolutions adopted by the United Nations could have paved the way or contributed significantly towards a solution. Unfortunately, peace in the Middle East continues to elude us because one of the parties to the conflict adheres to its policy of aggression and does not believe in peace and coexistence with its neighbours.

136. Recently, during the Special Political Committee's discussion of the item on Israeli practices against the human rights of the population of the occupied territories, the representative of Israel reiterated his country's "moral right" to Arab territories that it has occupied since 1967. The thrust of his assertions was that after 2,000 years the people of Israel were merely returning to their "promised land". But what of the people who have been living there? Should they just pack up and go, just conveniently disappear? Therein lies the core of the problem—Israel's refusal to give up territories it acquired through its war of aggression. It would appear that no solution will be acceptable to Israel unless it sanctions Israel's "right" to Arab lands.

137. Over the years, events in the Middle East have developed in a direction which makes a solution to the problem infinitely more difficult. The strategic concerns of the major Powers have become enmeshed with the problem, widening its dimensions. The intrusion of big-Power rivalry has added an apocalyptic element to the situation, which on several occasions has led the world to the brink of disaster. The Middle East continues to be a flash-point of potential conflict the effects of which would transcend the region, with grave repercussions for us all. The Secretary-General says in his report: "The interests of major Powers, which have political, economic and strategic concerns in the region, are also inevitably involved. New layers of complexity are thus added with each new war and the passage of time" [*A/39/600, para. 36*]. It is therefore imperative that the international community persevere in the search for a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question.

138. A comprehensive settlement must, by definition, include the return of Arab territories and the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and their own homeland. The overwhelming majority in the General Assembly have testified that such a comprehensive settlement must include the principles I have just outlined. It would appear that it is the acceptance and realization of those principles that can best ensure for Israel the attainment of the goal it seeks, or claims to seek—its right to exist. How can Israel justify its actions in terms of protecting its right to exist while denying the same right to others?

139. The Palestinian people are a reality; they cannot be wished away; nor can they be bombed, napalmed or shot away. Despite all the violence unleashed against them and the deprivation and indignity of having to live as refugees, the Palestinian will has not been broken. Indeed, all the persecution seems to reinforce their resolve to fight for their own identity and their right to be a nation. Israel, whose people, as Jews, were themselves once threatened with annihilation, must know this, must recognize and come to realize that its attempt to wipe out the Palestinian people is as immoral as Hitler's attempt to exterminate the Jews.

140. Israel's penchant for aggression and violence knows no bounds. The whole world was witness to the awesome destruction that it unleashed on Lebanon and to the massacres at Shatila and Sabra. Israel's obscene readiness to display its military might has been demonstrated repeatedly. The wonder of it all is that, in spite of its awesome capability and the fact that its arsenals contain the most advanced weaponry, Israel is still able to get away with the portrayal of itself as a little David. Israel is repeatedly forgiven for the terrorism it inflicts, while any action by Palestinians in defence of their rights is invariably branded as terrorism.

141. The overwhelming majority of us here have lamented Israel's absolute disregard of the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations. Despite our frustrations, we are, however, not deceived as to why Israel is able to ignore the pronouncements of the United Nations, being only too well aware that Israel's refusal to come to terms and accept a settlement fair to all, including Israel, is based on the protection of a single Power. It explains why, despite inflation running into several hundred per cent, Israel is still able to devote 50 per cent of its budget to defence. Billions of dollars in economic and military assistance are extended to Israel on most generous terms in the name of Israel's survival and justified in terms of Israel's strategic necessity. It is therefore no mystery why any number of resolutions can be adopted by the United Nations, which, we may rest assured, Israel will continue to ignore. Undoubtedly, Israel will also ignore any and all calls for a settlement except on its own terms.

142. In such circumstances, it is difficult to envisage a true chance for peace in the Middle East. Israel can only be emboldened to carry on its policy of aggression against its Arab neighbours. The dynamics of such a situation can only lead to sustained conflict, more outside involvement and thus escalation of the problem in a global sense.

143. Yet, as I stated earlier, we in the United Nations should push on with our efforts to make Israel and its benefactors see the wisdom of a just, comprehensive settlement. It is particularly at this time when the task seems hopeless that we must press on with renewed urgency, for to shrug our shoulders and stop trying would mean the death of the United Nations. It is in this context and in this spirit that my Government fully supports the efforts of the Secretary-General in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C to ensure the convening of a Middle East conference in which all the members of the Security Council and all the parties directly involved in the conflict, including the PLO, would participate. We commend the efforts of the Secretary-General and urge him to continue his consultations.

144. Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Secretary-General, in his report, has pointed out that: "The Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East and its key issue, the Palestinian problem, have remained unresolved despite intensive efforts undertaken by the United Nations and individual Member States during the past 37 years" [*ibid., para. 34*].

145. Indeed, the international community is exerting enormous efforts to find a peaceful solution to

the problem of the Middle East, which is one of the most acute problems of modern times.

146. The General Assembly is again examining that question and discussing ways and means of resolving it. The large number of participants in the present debate is a reflection of the great alarm of the States of the world concerning the further deterioration in the already very serious situation in the Middle East.

147. The cause of the further deterioration in the situation in that region remains the same. It is the aggressive, expansionist actions of Israel, in which it is being provided with all manner of aid and assistance by Washington. The strategic alliance of Israel and the United States causes the dangerous situation in the Middle East to worsen and is designed to serve the aim of Washington to establish its domination in that region. It is fitting here to condemn most firmly the direct, the military, and other interference of the United States in the affairs of the States of the region.

148. The absolute unwillingness, indeed, the refusal, of Israel to comply with Security Council and General Assembly resolutions relating to the problem of the Middle East are the main obstacles to the achievement of a settlement in the Middle East and are a challenge to the international community. The Mongolian delegation firmly condemns both this Israeli position and the obstructionist position of the United States, which are thwarting all efforts to achieve a genuine solution to the problem of the Middle East.

149. The Mongolian People's Republic also condemns the aggressive, expansionist actions of Israel against Lebanon and its inhuman actions in the occupied Lebanese territories, in violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[6] The Mongolian People's Republic has been speaking out consistently in favour of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territory in Lebanon, and respect for its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

150. My delegation firmly rejects the policy and practices of Israel in the occupied Arab territories. The Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, its actions designed to change the geographical character and demographic composition of those territories and the flagrant violation by Israel of the rights of the indigenous Arab population are contrary to international law and United Nations decisions.

151. Israel must heed the demands of the international community and must carry out all the pertinent decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

152. As in the past, the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the way to the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East lies through a comprehensive settlement of the full range of problems of this region, taking into account the legitimate interests of all the peoples and States of the region.

153. Any piecemeal attempts or any attempts at separate deals to resolve this question, as events have demonstrated, have not led to peace, but, on the contrary, have pushed away the prospects of peace and have created additional difficulties and complications. The people of Lebanon and its Government, who have had direct experience with the separate "peace" forced upon them, annulled the pertinent agreements with Israel. That is why that course, the course of separate deals, is rejected by the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations, as will be seen in the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/600*], as also in the Final Communiqué adopted at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October of this year [*see A/39/560*].

154. A comprehensive solution to this problem presupposes, as we have emphasized in the past, the recognition and exercise of the lawful rights of the Palestinian people. These include the right to the establishment of an independent State; the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem; respect for the right of all States of the region to a secure and independent existence. We proceed from the premise that guaranteeing the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine is the key question in the settlement of the Middle East problem. Without a just solution, it is not possible to establish a lasting peace in the region.

155. The Mongolian People's Republic considers that, for a comprehensive settlement to be reached, it is necessary to convene an international conference, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, which would then act on an equal footing. In this connection, the Mongolian delegation expresses its full support for the constructive proposals put forward by the Soviet Government on 29 July of this year [*see A/39/368*] to bring about a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the situation in the Middle East.

156. The Mongolian people and its Government express sincere solidarity with the struggle of the Arab peoples who stand for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their countries, for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied territories, and against the aggressive expansionist and annexationist actions of Israel. They systematically support the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine to secure its legal right, the right to self-determination, including the establishment of an independent State.

157. The Mongolian People's Republic stands firmly on the side of those who speak out for the peaceful settlement of the problem of the Middle East and for the establishment of a lasting peace in the region. It welcomes and supports the efforts of the United Nations and, in particular, of the Secretary-General in this direction.

158. Mr. TAÏB (Morocco) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again the General Assembly is considering the situation in the Middle East, as it has been doing for almost 40 years. This region is witnessing a serious crisis, endangering international peace and security, as a result of Israel's policy of aggression.

159. The majority of representatives who have spoken so far have referred to this dangerous situation, expressing the concern of world opinion about this problem and showing an international interest in finding a solution capable of guaranteeing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab States that are victims of aggression.

160. We can still hear the echo of the statements made last year, from this very rostrum, which strongly condemned the Israeli practices following the horrible massacres perpetrated by the Israeli

authorities in the wake of their invasion of Lebanon. Those massacres have shaken the conscience of the international community, and they require us to co-operate once again to repel aggression and to devise the means of reaching a just solution capable of restoring, at long last, stability and tranquillity in the Middle East region.

161. Regrettably, all those efforts have failed because of Israeli intransigence and arrogance. Israel does not listen to the voice of the international community, nor does it heed the resolutions adopted by various international forums condemning its actions.

162. Israel, by its continued occupation of the West Bank, the Golan Heights and the Gaza Strip, tries to consecrate its illegal presence through practices that run counter to international law and that have been condemned by international resolutions. The Israeli settlements, designed to change the demographic structure of the occupied territories, are multiplying daily. The expropriation of property, the demolition of houses and terrorization of the local population are continuing.

163. We also know that in the occupied territories and the Golan Heights, Israel has abolished local laws and replaced them with Israeli legislation. We are also aware of Israel's continuous violations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[6] We are also aware of the plunder of archaeological and cultural remains and of the destruction of farms, as well as of the imposition of collective punishment on the Arab population.

164. The Holy City of Jerusalem, the birthplace of several revealed religions, languishes under Israeli tyranny and injustice. It is the object of several ferocious attacks, aimed at Judaizing it and at changing its religious, historical and cultural characteristics. The Holy Places are the object of the endeavours of archaeological adventurers and of profanation. Many times over, they have been burnt and destroyed. Israel has succeeded in antagonizing Muslims and Christians alike on the question of the Holy City, acting in defiance of numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly calling upon it to respect the Holy Places and their sacred status.

165. All of this is the result of a deliberate policy based on expansionism and aggression and on the displacement and uprooting of an entire society in order to replace it with settlers from all over the world.

166. The international community has stated its views on this situation and has called on Israel immediately to withdraw from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and to restore to the Palestinian people, under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, the PLO, its inalienable right to return to its lands and to establish its own independent State in Palestine.

167. Despite the international consensus on these just principles—endorsed by United Nations resolutions—the doors of peace in the region remain locked owing to Israel's intransigence and its persistence in aggression, based on might, forced deportation and military occupation.

168. Faced with such a situation, the General Assembly should shoulder its responsibility to re-establish justice and bring an end to the tragedy unfolding in the Middle East, by adopting measures which will compel Israel to respect the international community's resolutions. These measures should include the imposition of the military, economic and other sanctions which are provided for in the Charter of the United Nations in the event that a State violates the resolutions, values and customs recognized and accepted by the international community.

169. My delegation calls upon the Assembly to take these decisive measures because Israeli practices in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories have gone even further than the usual practices of colonial Powers. These practices, in fact, are intended to eliminate an entire people, by liquidating it physically and politically, by confiscating its lands and by annexing the territory of neighbouring Arab States.

170. It is now recognized that any just and lasting solution of the Middle East conflict must be based on a solution of the Palestinian problem, which is at the core of the conflict in the Middle East and is the origin of the tragedy through which the peoples of the region have been living for so many years.

171. That has been the view of the General Assembly for years, as stressed in resolutions adopted at successive sessions. The Assembly has recognized the right of the Palestinian people to independence and sovereignty and its right to participate as a principal in all efforts to find a peaceful, just solution to the Middle East problem.

172. The Security Council, too, has condemned Israeli practices in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories and has declared the results of such practices null and void. It has also called for the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights and for the establishment by that people of an independent State of its own. That same position has been adopted by regional organizations and conferences, at which the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people have been stressed.

173. In the League of Arab States, the monarchs and other Heads of State of the Arab countries endorsed a courageous, positive and flexible initiative aimed at solving the problem. This initiative, known as the Fez plan, adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[4] has met with a favourable international reception. The Fez plan has formed the basis of large-scale Arab political activity designed to elucidate its objectives and the ways in which it can be implemented. In 1982, at the thirty-seventh session, King Hassan II of Morocco set out the plan before the General Assembly [*44th meeting*].

174. Since the Fez plan converges on some points with President Reagan's plan of 1 September 1982,[1] an attempt to merge the two on the basis of these similarities could help in reaching a just and comprehensive solution to this question, provided that the Soviet Union agrees to participate in an international conference to lay the foundations for such a solution.

175. Morocco, which had the honour to host the Fourth Islamic Summit Conference earlier this year, and whose King presides over the Al-Quds Committee—which seeks to assure the political and religious rights of the Arabs and Muslims in the Holy City of Jerusalem—wishes once again to condemn Israeli practices in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, especially in Jerusalem, and to express its full support for the exercise by the Palestinian people

of its inalienable rights and for the struggle of that people under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the PLO.

176. We call upon the United Nations to persist in its efforts to achieve the long-wished-for peace in the region of the Middle East, a peace which should be just, equitable and comprehensive and which should ensure just rights and restore usurped rights to their legitimate holders.

177. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express its thanks to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts in the cause of peace and justice in the region. We wish also to express our satisfaction at the efforts in this regard of various United Nations bodies, particularly those of the Secretariat's Division for Palestinian Rights and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

178. Mr. RÁCZ (Hungary): There was hardly a statement made by a Head of State or Minister for Foreign Affairs in the general debate that did not touch upon the situation in the Middle East. That is not surprising. This unique region, which has not known real and lasting peace for almost four decades now, affects us all in one way or another. If and when the situation there becomes more tense, it has adverse effects on the whole international situation; and, conversely, if and when there is or seems to be a movement in the right direction, towards peace, it exerts a favourable effect on the international atmosphere.

179. Unfortunately, if we want to be objective we have to state with much regret that at the present time we are not a bit closer to a solution than we were a year ago.

180. The main obstacle to a comprehensive settlement and the cause of the aggravation of the situation are the same as it has always been: the Israeli policy of aggression and expansion. Israel has continued since 1967 to occupy Arab territories and its troops have yet to be withdrawn from Lebanon, the latest victim of the Israeli war machine. With its aggression against Lebanon, and by its continuous occupation of the southern part of that country, Israel not only expanded territories under its occupation but further complicated the situation and made an overall solution even more difficult.

181. During past decades, Israel has displaced and uprooted the great majority of the Arab populations in the occupied territories and made several attempts to extend Israeli legislation to the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, clearly embarking upon a policy of annexation. The Israeli measures are aimed at deliberately changing the geographical character, the demographic nature and the legal status of the occupied areas, flagrantly violating the norms of international law, especially the generally recognized principle of the inadmissability of the acquisition of territories by force. When speaking about the situation in the region one cannot remain silent concerning one not insignificant circumstance well known to all—that is, the role played by the main ally of Israel, the United States, in shaping the situation in the region by providing constant and multifaceted support to Israel.

182. Looking at the record of the Israeli policy described earlier, one is forced to come to the conclusion—and it must be shared eventually by Israel also—that Israel is chasing a mirage if it seeks to make peace with its neighbours through wars of aggression and by illegally occupying the territories of others and sowing the seeds of hatred among the Arabs with its repressive measures.

183. If Israel wants to live in peace, it must recognize that its security is inseparably linked to the security of the Arabs and that its right to live and develop in peace can never be achieved at the expense of the other parties involved in the conflict and by denying them similar rights.

184. A just and lasting solution can be achieved only through peaceful means, with the agreement of the parties concerned; and, since there are many parties to this conflict involving complex and interrelated issues, it is obvious that the Middle East conflict can ultimately be solved only by a comprehensive settlement covering all its aspects. If the history of the Middle East problem teaches us anything it is that unilateral and one-sided approaches, separate deals, do not work; they do not lead to a lasting solution.

185. I should like to mention also that, in order to make some progress towards a solution, it is necessary to strengthen the unity of the Arab countries and of the Palestinian movement so that the lack of such unity cannot be exploited to prevent a just and lasting solution. Needless to say, the United Nations, which has been involved in this question since its inception, has also a role to play in searching for ways and means of reaching a solution. It has already proved its usefulness in adopting resolutions embodying the common will of the international community, and it can serve as a useful framework for our future activities as well.

186. Through many years of discussions and efforts both here in the United Nations and through bilateral diplomacy, a growing international consensus seems to be emerging concerning the conditions for a comprehensive settlement. These are: the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem; the guaranteeing of the inalienable national and human rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, the right to establish their own independent sovereign State; and the guaranteeing of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to secure an independent existence and development.

187. A comprehensive settlement could best be achieved within the framework of an international conference on the Middle East especially convened for the purpose. In this regard, we support the proposals of the Soviet Union put forward on 29 July of this year [*A/39/368*], which incidentally is in conformity on major points with the emerging international consensus referred to earlier.

188. We recognize that there are differences among the parties concerned on many important issues, but these differences should not and must not prevent a dialogue. On the contrary, a just and lasting solution can be arrived at only through talks, through negotiations between all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

189. It is high time to renew international efforts to create the necessary conditions for an international conference on peace in the Middle East.

190. We are convinced that joint efforts can lead to results and that, even if we cannot hope to have a

solution by next year, we shall at least have a report on some progress.

191. Mr. MUSTAFA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): There is perhaps no need for me to explain the extreme importance of the debate in this Assembly on the situation in the Middle East, not only because of the repeated challenge which this question poses to the authority and credibility of the United Nations, but also because it constitutes a threat to peace and stability in this sensitive region and in the world in general.

192. The situation in the Middle East has become a perennial item on the agenda of the General Assembly. It has continued to gain increasing attention in the United Nations because the Palestinian problem constitutes the core and origin of the question of the Middle East and because the international community attaches great importance to that, and to the fact that the Palestinian people have been expelled from their homes and deprived of their properties ever since the start of the Zionist onslaught against a region which has played a role in the development of human civilization and which continues to provide the world with vital contributions in different spheres.

193. The continuous deterioration of the situation in the Middle East has led to increased alarm as a result of these events, not to mention Israel's arrogance and recalcitrance in refusing to accord to the Palestinian people their natural and legitimate rights. It is clear that the region is threatened with new conflagrations. The invasion of Lebanon and the tearing apart of the fabric of that society, the massacre of innocent women, children and the elderly, the barbaric practices against various countries of the region—all have become the standard practice of the Zionist entity. That entity, which has been implanted in the Middle East region, continues to deny to the Palestinian people its inalienable rights, which have been recognized by the international community and guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations. It has continued to challenge the will of the international community and the principles of the Charter. It still pursues its policy of expansion and annexation of Arab territories by force of arms, a policy publicly proclaimed by the rulers of Israel. The world at large has not forgotten the crimes being constantly committed by Israel against the Palestinian people, the repression of the peoples of the occupied Arab territories and the banishment of local leaders. Israel's aggression assumed another dimension when it bombed the Iraqi nuclear installations, annexed the Golan Heights and invaded Lebanon. Its crimes have multiplied: Israel has desecrated the Al-Aqsa mosque; it is trying to distort the characteristics of the occupied Arab territories; it is deporting their original populations and establishing settlements, in addition to a record of mass murder, destruction of houses of civilians, the Judaization of the land and the proclamation of Jerusalem as the eternal capital of Israel.

194. The international community is now firmly convinced that Israel is not a peace-loving country. At its ninth emergency special session, held from 29 January to 5 February 1982, the General Assembly took a decision that confirmed this [*resolution ES-9/1*]. Subsequent resolutions of the Assembly have defined the great danger inherent in Israel's aggressive behaviour. It is clear that this aggressive entity is totally disregarding the Charter of the United Nations and international laws and customs, since there is no deterrent to ensure its compliance with the will of the international community. Israel and its expansionist dreams and recklessness are threatening a grave deterioration in the Middle East and in the conflict, with all its tragic and sad dimensions.

195. On many occasions and in numerous forums the international community has reaffirmed that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and the granting to the Palestinian people of the right to self-determination, the right to return to their homes and recover their property, and the right to establish their sovereign independent State on their national soil, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the PLO. The international community recently reiterated those principles at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983. The Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[11] which was endorsed last year by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, called for the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East with a view to achieving a just and lasting settlement of the conflict in the region. The wide international participation in the Geneva Conference has conferred legitimacy on this positive contribution by the United Nations towards the desired objective. We believe that this call for the holding of an international conference must meet with a positive response if we want the region to enjoy the peace which it has not known for centuries. The negative Israeli stance concerning the holding of such a conference is but another link in the chain of its well-known attitude towards every sincere call for a peaceful settlement. It has rejected peace initiatives, including the Arab peace plan endorsed on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.[4] Israel's policy has always been to resort to the force of arms in total disregard of the fact that a peace imposed by force inevitably brings in its wake destruction, violence and more war. Israel must realize that its sterile reading of the situation in the Middle East is no longer convincing to anyone. Its persistence in trying to divert attention from the Palestinian question by delving into other questions fools no one. Israel has been and continues to be the cause of all tension in the Middle East. It fans the flames of strife and turmoil in all the countries of the region. It must fully realize that such a role is indeed reckless and that its policies are destructive and will end only in total failure. The statement of the representative of Israel yesterday [*72nd meeting*] concerning Arab differences will not legitimize its occupation of the lands of others. The international community will not be deceived by allegations by Israel of other differences, which indeed are the product of Israel's machinations.

196. In the Sudan we were able to foil an Israeli intervention in the south of the country, and our success in putting an end to a conflict which had lasted 17 years has met with international approval. Israel's allegations will in no way diminish such a great achievement.

197. His references to certain alleged measures and problems only reflects Israel's arrogance and its attacks on the liberty of other peoples that have chosen their own system and their own religious

beliefs, free from any outside intervention or coercion.

198. The question of Palestine will remain the core of the Middle East conflict. It is therefore incumbent on the international community to intensify its efforts to compel Israel to bow to its will and to ensure that the Palestinian people is able to exercise self-determination.

199. In spite of the savagery of the Zionist massacres and the continuous deterioration of the situation in the region, the Palestinian people continue at every opportunity to give firm evidence of their cultural authenticity and the justice of their cause. My delegation would like to pay tribute to the Palestine National Council on the occasion of its meeting in Amman, which is a positive event at a time when that region is facing historic challenges which demand the closing of ranks and the unification of positions.

200. Further, in the context of positive events, my delegation very much welcomes the restoration of relations between Egypt and Jordan, since this represents support for the common Arab effort. We believe that the two countries, whose commitment to the Palestinian cause is well known, will certainly be able to meet the historic challenges facing them.

201. My delegation cannot fail to refer to the dangerous collaboration between Pretoria and Tel Aviv in the face of the struggle in the Arab and African regions. Such collaboration adds to the challenges facing the African people in South Africa and Namibia and the Palestinian people, especially as the conspiratorial nature of such collaboration has become clear and it is obviously aimed at denying the right of peoples to self-determination. A few years ago we tackled the question of the policy of *apartheid* of South Africa; today we are facing another challenge, a challenge by Israel directed against the peoples of the Arab region. Efforts to thwart the machinations of those Axis allies must be redoubled.

202. We wish to extend our thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report [*A/39/600*] and particularly for having referred to the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East, the adverse effects of the failure to solve these problems and the implications for the credibility of the United Nations and the hopes placed in it. We also express our appreciation of the work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

203. It is more necessary today than at any other time in the past for the United Nations to shoulder its responsibilities in the Middle East and to ensure for the Palestinian people exercise of their right to self-determination, sovereignty on their national soil and an independent State. Israel must learn that peace is indivisible and that justice cannot be restricted to one people alone.

204. Mr. KURODA (Japan): The situation in the Middle East continues to be increasingly volatile and deeply complex, and hopes for peace remain dim. In particular, we regret that no concrete progress has yet been made with regard to the situation in Lebanon in spite of the efforts of the parties concerned.

205. Lebanon has left glorious footprints on the path of world history and has made major contributions to Arab culture in the modern age. It is tragic that the national energies of such a country are being consumed in a civil war.

206. The most important elements in restoring peace to Lebanon are, first, the prompt achievement of national reconciliation and, secondly, the withdrawal of all foreign forces so as to enable Lebanon to re-establish its territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty.

207. The Japanese Government strongly hopes that the Lebanese people, in particular the parties to the national reconciliation talks, will make serious efforts towards the restoration of national unity. Specifically, we hope that they will demonstrate a flexible attitude based on a long-range and broad perspective and will strive to co-ordinate sectarian interests. Furthermore, it is essential that an environment be created in which all foreign forces can leave Lebanon as soon as possible.

208. In this connection, Japan welcomes the fact that Israel and Lebanon have entered into talks, convened by the Secretary-General, regarding military aspects relating to the withdrawal of Israeli forces and security arrangements in Lebanon. Japan hopes that both parties will do their utmost to achieve concrete results.

209. The situation in Lebanon underlines the urgent need to find a solution to the Middle East problem as a whole. I should like to take this opportunity to restate the basic position of the Government of Japan on the Middle East problem, at the core of which is the question of Palestine. First, peace in the Middle East must be just, lasting and comprehensive. Secondly, such a peace should be achieved through the early and complete implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and through recognition of and respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, under the Charter of the United Nations. Thirdly, each and every path towards the realization of such a peace must be explored, with careful consideration being given to the legitimate security requirements of the countries in the region and to the aspirations of all the peoples in the region, including the Palestinian people. Fourthly, Japan is of the view that the PLO represents the Palestinian people. Thus, Japan believes that, in order to advance the cause of peace in the Middle East, it is essential that Israel and the PLO recognize each other's position and that the PLO participate in the peace process.

210. I should like to stress my Government's longstanding appeal to all parties, including Israel and the PLO, to resolve their problems through negotiations and not to resort to the use of force, in order to bring about a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the region. To this end, it is necessary that both the Israeli and the Palestinian peoples make sincere efforts to dispel mutual distrust and foster a genuine will to coexist in peace.

211. In this context, Japan regards Israel's policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories as a major obstacle to peace efforts. Nor can it condone Israel's measures to change unilaterally the status of the occupied Arab territories, such as its annexation of East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights.

212. At the same time, Japan strongly appeals to Israel, as the occupying authority, to make special efforts to protect the human rights of the Palestinian inhabitants in accordance with the Geneva Conven-

tion relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[6]

213. Furthermore, we hope that, in order that the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people may be recovered, the unity of the PLO will be restored and that it will consolidate its position as an integral party in the search for peace.

214. Various international efforts have been made towards the achievement of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. I refer, for example, to President Reagan's initiative of 1 September 1982[1] and to the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.[4] The Government of Japan strongly hopes that, in order to break the present stalemate, the parties concerned will take such proposals into account and, with a realistic, constructive and flexible attitude, make serious efforts towards the achievement of genuine peace in the Middle East.

215. There is, of course, no easy solution to the Middle East problem. But the Government of Japan reaffirms its intention to co-operate in all efforts towards the early attainment of our common goal—a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East achieved through a process of negotiation and without recourse to the use of force.

216. Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): The Somali delegation shares the deep concern expressed by many preceding speakers over the complete lack of progress towards a just, peaceful and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. Indeed, only retrograde steps are evident, whether we consider the question of Palestinian rights—a question at the heart of the Middle East conflict—the question of occupied Arab territory, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, or the continuing tragedy of Lebanon.

217. Furthermore, as the Secretary-General has observed in his report [*ibid.*], the recurring crises of the area have added new layers of complexity which tend to obfuscate the fundamental issues and divert international attention from them. This state of affairs can only add to international tensions, threaten world peace and security and make the prospect of a just and lasting settlement more distant than ever.

218. The central factor in the chronic unrest and violence in the Middle East is undoubtedly Israel's success in ignoring with impunity the principles and measures established by the United Nations as an appropriate basis for Middle East peace. The list of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions treated with contempt by Israel is, as we know, a long one. Consequently, the Middle East question is closely linked to the question of the authority of the United Nations and its efforts to establish the rule of law in international affairs.

219. My Government wishes to affirm its strong support for the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council aimed at achieving the important international goal of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We are convinced, first of all, that this goal cannot be achieved without universal recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to statehood in Palestine. In this regard, the world community must not fail to condemn Israel's genocidal attempt to eliminate the Palestinian people in Lebanon and to pre-empt the establishment of a Palestinian State through its illegal settlements and terror tactics aimed at intimidating the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza.

220. Certainly the restoration of Palestinian rights must figure prominently in a comprehensive Middle East settlement, and any process of negotiation to that end must include the representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO.

221. Israel's creeping annexation of occupied Arab territory, in defiance of Security Council resolutions and in clear contravention of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War,[6] is of course a major obstacle to the achievement of peace in the Middle East and a major challenge to the authority of the United Nations.

222. The world community must continue to demand the reversal of the Israeli settlements policy, an end to oppressive policies which violate the human rights of the Arab people under occupation, and an end to attempts to change the demographic character and legal status of occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories.

223. Much lip-service is paid to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which emphasize the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory through aggression. But what has been the result of Israel's refusal over the past 17 years to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territory, in accordance with those resolutions?

224. It must also be asked what repercussions have been set in motion by Israel's arrogant and illegal annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in defiance of the clearest international consensus on this matter and of repeated condemnations and declarations of invalidity by the Security Council.

225. As Member States are fully aware, Israel has been able to defy the United Nations on these matters with impunity. Furthermore, Israel has not been called to account in any significant way for the continuing tragedy in Lebanon. Yet its invasion of that territory, its unjustified and brutal military aggression, in which thousands of non-combatants have been wantonly killed, and its oppressive occupation of Lebanese territory are all criminal violations of international law.

226. After more than three decades of tension and conflict it should be obvious that no interests of any kind are served by continued turmoil in the Middle East area. Every effort should be made by all concerned to advance the cause of peace in the region.

227. My Government welcomed the positive contribution of the Arab peace plan adopted unanimously on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.[4] Regrettably, Israel's response continues to be the pursuit of its expansionist plans through *faits accomplis*.

228. We believe, with the Secretary-General, that in the search for solutions time is of the essence, since the emergence of new factors could well mean a further deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. In our view, an international peace conference on the Middle East could well give an important and useful impetus to a negotiating process. The immediate necessity, however, is to put pressure on Israel to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and to desist from its violations of international conventions to which it is a party. The threat to regional and international peace and security posed by its expansionist, illegal and aggressive policies clearly demands action by the Security Council under

Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. My Government also associates itself with the call to Member States to refrain from extending military, economic or other support to Israel which would encourage it to pursue its aggressive policies.

229. In conclusion, I wish to emphasize my delegation's belief that a framework for negotiations on a comprehensive Middle East settlement exists and has long existed in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We urge all the States most closely concerned to make a new and sincere effort to address the fundamental issues at stake in the Middle East and to promote a just and lasting peace in the region.

230. Mr. KORNEENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Among the hotbeds of tension on our planet which are threatening international peace and security and causing great concern to the international community, pride of place is taken by the Middle East. For more than 37 years now, this area has been a dangerous hotbed of crises and conflict, and the attention of the United Nations has been focused on it. Because there has been no settlement in the situation, the major, vital interests of the peoples of the Middle East have been jeopardized. An entire generation has grown up there without knowing real peace, and the peoples of the region have not been given any further comfort in the past year.

231. The reason for the present dangerous situation, as everybody knows, can be found in the aggressive, expansionist policy of those in the ruling circles of Israel, which is carried out with the support and participation of imperialist countries. In spite of the many decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, Israel continues to occupy the Arab lands which it seized in 1967 and is taking further steps to colonize and annex them. The inalienable rights of the suffering Arab people of Palestine continue to be violated. These people are living in conditions of Israeli occupation and some are forced to leave their homeland. The Palestinian and other Arab peoples in the occupied territories are enduring mass terror and violence, while a policy of changing the demographic nature and economic structure of the seized Arab lands is being pursued.

232. Responsibility for the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East and the lack of any settlement of the Middle East conflict is fully shared by the United States, the senior partner of Israel in "strategic co-operation". In their efforts to promote their strategic interests, these "partners" have adopted a policy of imposing separate anti-Arab deals, dividing up the Arab countries and strengthening the American military presence in the region under the pretext of so-called vital interests. That policy is designed to achieve for them domination over the region and to suppress Arab national and patriotic forces.

233. However, the events of the past year have shown quite clearly the unprofitable nature of the policy of force and military adventurism in the Middle East.

234. The gamble on a show of military force and armed intervention in the affairs of Lebanon did not come off. The armies of the United States and their allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization had to leave Lebanese territory hastily and they had to end their interventionist so-called multinational forces mission.

235. The aggression against Lebanon has not brought any glory either to the organizers and executors of that plan. Indeed, it was a serious political and military defeat for them. According to press reports, the Lebanese adventure cost Israel $3.5 billion and more than 600 Israelis paid for it with their lives. By and large, today, in Tel Aviv itself, people have begun to realize that the country has been led into an impasse because of the senseless expansionist policy.

236. Nevertheless, the occupation of about one third of the territory of Lebanon continues, and the Israeli high-level military authorities are pursuing a policy of terror and oppression against the Lebanese and the Palestinians. Flouting the norms of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, Israel is refusing to comply with the relevant decisions of the Security Council that the occupation of the territory of sovereign Lebanon must be ended and is attempting to divide it up. The seriousness of the situation in that country is shown by the fact that in this year alone the Security Council has met four times to discuss the actions of the aggressor. A little more than two months ago, because of the negative position of the United States, the Council failed to adopt a draft resolution calling upon Israel, the occupying Power, to respect generally acknowledged norms of international law. And this, unfortunately, is not the only example of the obstruction of the efforts of the United Nations and interested States to bring about a settlement of the Middle East problem.

237. In continuing the bankrupt policy of separate deals, the United States and Israel are rejecting out of hand constructive proposals which are designed to achieve a comprehensive Middle East settlement. This happened, for example, with the peace plan adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.[4] As is well known, the "strategic" partners have blocked efforts undertaken in implementation of the decisions of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, and those of the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, efforts designed to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East, which is the only true and genuine procedure for achieving a just settlement in the Middle East. Such a policy clearly demonstrates the intentions of Israel and those who aid and abet it to continue to speak with the Arabs in the language of diktat and to impose upon them conditions for a settlement which takes into account only the interests of Israel and forces the Arabs to come to terms with the high-handedness of Israel and its policies in the occupied Arab territories. Quite naturally, the peoples of the region and their Governments reject any "recipes" for such a sham settlement.

238. The Ukrainian SSR is firmly convinced that the Middle East cannot find peace through a policy of force or through the imposition of an alien will on the parties to the conflict. A solution to the problem is urgent, but it should be political in nature; it should be comprehensive and it should take into account the interests of all countries of the region.

239. This, in fact, was the programme of a comprehensive, just settlement of the Middle East that we found in the Soviet proposals of 29 July of this year

[*A/39/368*]. Those proposals are based, first and foremost, on the fact that we should uphold the principle of the inadmissibility of the seizure of lands of others by aggression. All territories occupied by Israel in 1967 should be returned to the Arabs. We must, in practice, ensure the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to the establishment of its own independent State on Palestinian lands freed from Israeli occupation. Palestinian refugees should be granted the opportunity of returning to their homes or receive compensation. The eastern part of Jerusalem should be returned to the Arabs and should become an inalienable part of the Palestinian State. We must firmly ensure the right of all States of the region to a secure and independent existence and development, put an end to constant wars and bring about peace between the Arab States and Israel. Finally, international guarantees for a Middle East settlement are proposed. As was pointed out in the proposals, the Soviet Union is prepared to take part in such guarantees.

240. The broadest avenue to a comprehensive settlement is through an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all interested countries, including, of course, the participation, on an equal footing, of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. It is not difficult to notice that the basic principles for a Middle East settlement proposed by the Soviet Union are a summary of earlier initiatives and take into account the interests of all parties to the conflict. When one views those proposals, which have received broad international support at this session of the General Assembly as well, it can be seen that they have become a sort of litmus test, a measure of the seriousness with which various States seek a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

241. While we sternly condemn the policy of aggression and annexation against Arab countries, the Ukrainian SSR would like to express its solidarity with the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their inalienable rights. We support the just cause of the Arab peoples who are waging a struggle against Israeli aggression and occupation. The unconditional and earliest possible withdrawal of the Israeli armies, as requested by Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), is a necessary step.

242. We condemn the policy of imperialist forces in building up their military presence in the areas of the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea and we support limiting naval activities of foreign governments in those regions. We are against the establishment of foreign military bases, the proliferation of nuclear weaponry, the threat of the use of force and interference in the internal affairs of other States of the region.

243. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports decisions that would help us to seek a just peace in the Middle East, in the interests of the peoples living there.

244. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Even more than in the past, the Middle East remains an area of great instability and one of the primary sources of threats to international peace, security and co-operation. The dangers of the persistent conflict in the Middle East, and the many questions it has opened which have still not been settled, are even greater in the present particularly tense international atmosphere, which is the result of policies of maintaining and redividing spheres of influence, the intensification of the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and the emergence of new conflicts while old conflicts continue.

245. The confrontations that exist in the Middle East and the entire development of the Israeli-Arab conflict confirm again, if this is necessary, the historical truth that peace and security cannot be built and ensured by the threat or use of force or by denying the right of other peoples to freedom and independence. It is axiomatic that peace and security can be achieved only on the basis of respect for the legitimate rights of other countries and for new principles and norms of conduct in international relations.

246. Therefore, it is high time that all Member States assume their high political and moral responsibilities and that the United Nations, whose primary function it is to maintain peace and security throughout the world, act more decisively to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of this conflict that has lasted only too long, causing untold suffering to the peoples in the area and seriously endangering peace in the world.

247. Romania and its President are in favour of settling conflicts and disputes among States exclusively by peaceful means and by negotiations. No matter how prolonged and difficult they may be, peaceful means and negotiations, in our opinion, are the only reasonable way of solving disputes among States, the only alternative to conflicts and deadly wars.

248. As President Nicolae Ceauşescu recently said, at the Thirteenth Congress of the Romanian Communist Party, Romania has always been strongly in favour of a political settlement in the Middle East, one guaranteeing a comprehensive peace in the region, and of settling the problem of the Palestinian people on the basis of their right to self-determination, including their right to the creation of an independent Palestinian State. In this spirit, we are in favour of an international conference, with the participation of all interested States, including the PLO. A comprehensive settlement must lead to the achievement of a just and lasting peace, to guarantees for the independence and sovereignty of all States in the area.

249. On the basis of its position of principle that the occupation of foreign territories and their acquisition by force are inadmissable, Romania has from the start consistently maintained that for the future peace settlement in the Middle East to be just and lasting, the first requirement is the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied since the 1967 war, including the Arab part of Jerusalem. This requirement has been clearly formulated in the relevant United Nations resolutions and has been stressed repeatedly in all forums which have considered the situation in the Middle East. As is well known, we are strongly opposed to Israel's actions aimed at annexing the Syrian Golan Heights. Romania is also in favour of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon, the national reconciliation of internal political forces and guarantees of the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

250. All the developments in the situation in the Middle East and the absence of progress towards a comprehensive settlement have only made it increas-

ingly clear that without a solution to the Palestinian problem there can be no comprehensive, just and lasting peace. An essential component of such a settlement is recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the establishment of an independent Palestinian State, as well as recognition of its right to participate through its legitimate representative, the PLO, in negotiations on peace in the Middle East. At the same time, we believe that one pre-condition of any solution that will fully meet the legitimate interests and aspirations of States and peoples of the Middle East is the guaranteeing of the right of every State in the region to free and sovereign existence, independence and territorial integrity, which would make possible relations of co-operation, trust and mutual respect among all States and peoples of the region.

251. Like other countries, Romania has constantly advocated and promoted increased political and diplomatic efforts to find solutions to all the complex problems of the area and to achieve a comprehensive settlement and a just and lasting peace. As early as 1978 President Nicolae Ceauşescu put forward the idea of convening an international conference on peace in the Middle East, within the framework and with the active participation of the United Nations and with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as other countries which could make a positive contribution to the settlement of the complicated problems of that part of the world.

252. This idea has been included in General Assembly resolutions, is supported by an ever-increasing number of States and, finally, is endorsed in resolution 38/58 C, of 13 December 1983, of which the Romanian delegation was a sponsor. Romania believes that this initiative remains relevant and that increased efforts by all States and by the international community are needed to ensure that such a conference is convened as soon as possible.

253. We share the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his report [*A/39/600*] that such a conference could provide a flexible framework for all the necessary negotiations on the settlement of all the outstanding questions. Similarly, the Romanian delegation shares the opinion of other delegations that the time has come for all the countries concerned and all the political forces of the region to promote the organization of such a conference, which would be a significant contribution to the achievement of the comprehensive, just settlement so anxiously awaited by the peoples of the region and of the entire world. As the Secretary-General says in his report: "In the light of the deep tension in the Middle East . . . , nothing could be less realistic than to expect the indefinite continuation of the present situation of no peace–no war" [*ibid., para. 49*].

254. It seems to us to be futile to seek partial solutions, to the exclusion of some of the parties concerned, for this is an overall problem, as complex as the entire situation in the Middle East.

255. Is there any reasonable alternative, therefore, to a conference organized under United Nations auspices at which all the parties concerned can defend, as appropriate, their legitimate interests within the framework of an overall, just and lasting peace settlement?

256. The United Nations can and must play an increasingly active role in efforts to resolve the conflict in the Middle East and ensure the conditions for comprehensive negotiations, under its auspices, leading to a just and lasting peace in this troubled area of the world, a peace that will fully meet the hopes and expectations of the peoples of the region and, indeed, the peoples of the entire world.

257. Romania is determined to continue to do whatever it can to make its contribution to the search for a just and lasting settlement of the problems of the Middle East, to the establishment of a just peace in the region and to the strengthening of international peace, security and co-operation.

258. Mr. CABALLERO (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The subject of the Middle East continues to claim a position of priority on the agenda of the General Assembly.

259. The constructive position taken by the Arab countries and the PLO concerning the various initiatives aimed at achieving a just and lasting settlement of the conflict in the Middle East continues to stand out in contrast to the arrogant, intransigent attitude of the Tel Aviv leaders. In clear defiance of the many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, Israel continues to pursue its well-known expansionist plans and to make itself an ever greater source of danger to peace and security in the region and, therefore, in the world as a whole.

260. In this context, a few days ago the Special Political Committee completed consideration of the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, in which it was stated unequivocally that in the past year the Tel Aviv Government had intensified in those territories its practices and policies aimed at creating the necessary conditions for the final annexation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan Heights.

261. At the same time, following the brutal invasion and the crimes committed by the Israeli forces in Lebanon, the Tel Aviv authorities have striven relentlessly to maintain their occupation forces in the southern part of the country in their attempts to incorporate part of Lebanese territory in their expansionist plans, in keeping with their long-held ambitions so well known to the world public.

262. How has it been possible for Israel to continue for more than three decades to disregard the will of the international community, fail to comply with the many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and, with its practices and policies, systematically violate the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations? But this is no secret. The sole explanation for this lies in the unconditional support which the Israeli Government receives from the United States for its political, diplomatic, economic and military plans.

263. For this reason, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, now encompassing 101 full-fledged members, at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, stated its position on United States assistance to Israel in strong terms. The Ministers and Heads of Delegations, in considering the situation in the Middle East,

"denounced once again the continued support provided by the Government of the United States for these Israeli practices and acts as well as all forms of American assistance, particularly the agreements of mutual co-operation between them within the framework of their strategic alliance which threatens the security of the region and the world, and confirms the United States' total partiality toward Israel" [*A/39/560, para. 60*].

264. That negotiations were renewed to increase assistance to Israel could be deduced from the recent talks held in Washington between the leaders of both countries. Israeli-American talks were also aimed at frustrating any attempt to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict, as was recently reflected in the refusal of both Governments to accept efforts by the Secretary-General to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East, in keeping with the Geneva Declaration on Palestine[11] and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[12] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, and with resolution 38/58 C of the General Assembly.

265. In view of the deterioration of the situation in the region and the dangers that situation represents for international peace and security, this forum must insist on the need for an early convening of that peace conference and unequivocally support the Secretary-General's efforts to that end.

266. The peace conference, in which all the parties concerned must participate, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must help to bring about a just and lasting peace on the basis of the complete withdrawal of Israel from occupied territories and the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish a sovereign, independent Palestinian State.

267. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): Once again the General Assembly is considering the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East". As in past years, this world body is again engaged in the search for a just and lasting solution in a region which has not seen peace for four decades and at a time when ominous signs of deterioration in the situation are obvious.

268. Because of our geographical proximity, the close historical ties that bind the Arab people with the people of Cyprus and the nature of the issues inherent in the situation, we are of necessity vitally involved as a people and as a country.

269. The Middle East has been accurately described in various reports of the Secretaries-General as presenting one of the major world problems, posing a direct threat to international peace and security, and, in addition to its intrinsic dangers, heavily contributing to the polarization which we witness today.

270. On the other hand, a just, comprehensive and lasting solution of this challenging problem would prove to be a major positive development, with benefits to the countries involved and to the whole of the Middle East, and would contribute to the amelioration of the present negative world climate.

271. The tragic developments of past years and the unending suffering of the peoples of all the countries involved in the conflict confirm that no just and lasting peace can be achieved by the use of force. The acquisition and annexation of territories by force, the uprooting of peoples, the illegal settlements and the violation of the rights of others are contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of international law and thus are totally unacceptable in a twentieth century enlightened world.

272. It is with those thoughts in mind that Cyprus, along with the other non-aligned countries, supports and strives for a peaceful, just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict through negotiations, as proposed at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, in accordance with the Charter, resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the declarations of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

273. In those negotiations, the participation on an equal footing of the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, along with other interested parties to the dispute, is indispensable. We firmly believe that no solution to the Middle East problem can be envisaged which does not take fully and justly into account the national aspirations of the Palestinian people. We consider the question of Palestine as the core of the Middle East problem and the realization of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty as a *sine qua non* to its solution. Only when that right has been universally recognized and respected, as called for by General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), of 22 November 1974, will all States in the region indeed live within safe and internationally recognized boundaries.

274. We further believe that for the solution to be just and lasting it must entail the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the old city of Jerusalem. Israel must rescind its illegal and unilateral decision with regard to the Golan Heights, which constitutes an inseparable part of the territorial integrity of Syria, and withdraw its troops from Lebanon, that much tormented, friendly and neighbouring State.

275. Even though the situation in the Middle East lends itself to pessimistic appraisals and fears of another major conflagration, it also constitutes a challenge for mankind, and mainly for the United Nations, whose primary purpose is the maintenance of international peace and security. The problem is grave; it is also challenging. It is a problem which has evaded solution for as long as the United Nations has existed.

276. Next year, the United Nations will commemorate its fortieth anniversary. Even though in this world of power politics, of "might is right", we do not necessarily believe in miraculous developments, we do believe that we owe it to ourselves and to succeeding generations to redouble our efforts, reconsider our policies and rededicate ourselves to the everlasting principles of the Charter of the United Nations in a concerted endeavour towards the solution of this major crisis and this endless, bloodletting problem.

277. A just solution of the Middle East problem is imperative, not only for reducing grave tensions in the ever-worsening international climate but also for sustaining and nourishing renewed faith in the credibility of the United Nations as the Organization of peace and in its lofty and everlasting principles.

278. Perpetuation of the Middle East problem is perpetuation of world problems. Its solution will definitely contribute to the salvation of mankind.

279. Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) (*interpretation from Arabic*): When we consider the situation in the Middle East, whether on the basis of the valuable reports of the Secretary-General or going beyond them, we find that there is really no conflict in the true sense of the word. We find, however, that Israel has occupied Palestine by force and illegally attacked the peoples of the States in the region, in defiance of all the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. This has damaged the credibility of the United Nations in the eyes of the world public. It is only natural that Israel continues its acts of aggression, since strong sanctions, which would have put an end to the military, economic, financial, humanitarian and technological assistance it receives, have not been imposed on it.

280. It might perhaps be useful to recall that what we are now witnessing in the Middle East is the result of a colonialist, Zionist plan dating back to the beginning of this century. In 1907, the colonialist States held a conference in London to consider colonization in the world and in the regions where they felt threatened. In his report, Campbell-Bannerman, then British Prime Minister, said:

> "The greatest threat to imperialism is in the Mediterranean, which is a link between the East and the West, and on the eastern and southern coasts on which live peoples that possess all the elements of unity and cohesion, that have resources that enabled them to make progress and to develop."

The report also recommended that the imperialist States should endeavour to divide up this region and oppose all attempts at unity between those peoples. It proposed, as an urgent step, that the African zone be separated from the Asian zone by the establishment of a foreign human buffer which the imperialists could use for the attainment of their objectives.

281. As soon as that imperialist plan for the Middle East was drawn up, the Zionists seized the opportunity to volunteer to play the role they are playing today. They succeeded in persuading the imperialist States to entrust them with this task. They sent letters to the imperialist States stating their desire to control the entire region and to establish Zionist colonialism and imperialism. I will read one of those letters, which were published in *The Struggle between the Arabs and Israel*, a book by nine authors, including Mehdi ben Baraka, Khairy Hamad and Lotfi el Khouly:

> "The countries we intend to occupy include lower Egypt—that is, northern Egypt—the southern part of Syria and Lebanon. Thus, we shall be able to control trade with India, the Arab peninsula and eastern and southern Africa. We believe that France cannot but support the idea of the route to India and China controlled by a people which will defend it to the death."

In a letter sent to the German Kaiser Wilhelm II, we read:

> "We"—that is, the Zionists—"intend to create on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean a modern civilization and a trade centre which will be a bulwark of German sovereignty, directly or indirectly. Palestine will thus become, thanks to the immigration of Jews, a political and trade base, indeed, a German compound."

282. It is not surprising, therefore, that Israel is the cause of the tension and instability in the Middle East. Indeed, this is its objective and the justification for its existence. Protection, the provision of weapons, and financial assistance enabled it to occupy Palestine, as well as other Arab territories in 1967.

283. As for Lebanon, as soon as it achieved independence and its financial institutions were established and the economic and cultural life of the country began to develop, Israel launched attacks against that peaceful country. "But it is possible that ye dislike a thing which is good for you" [*Koran, Surah II:216*], for Israel's repeated attacks have strengthened the determination of the peoples of the region. Israel boasted that it was invincible and claimed that no Arab force could conquer it and that it had destroyed three Arab armies in 1967. Today, however, we see that Israel has for years been faced with violent resistance by Syria.

284. The Palestinian revolution, even within the occupied Arab territories, has intensified over the past years. By its patriotism and great courage, the Lebanese people have given an example of struggle against foreign invasion, reminding us of the glories of history we have seen in Japan, Viet Nam and Algeria and, in the face of the Nazi invasion, in Europe.

285. In fact, Lebanon's unity was strengthened following the Israeli invasion. Actually, the various national parties, regardless of their religious or political doctrines, adopted the cause of the homeland. Thus, the Lebanese people have proved to Israel that its calculations were erroneous, to wit, that the Christians and Muslims would engage in a civil war that would enable Israel to occupy all the territory it wanted.

286. Israel is disregarding the fact that Christian Arabs have played their role, side by side with their Muslim brothers, in ensuring a modern Arab renaissance. Many parties and national Arab groups have Christian leaders, and Israel is probably not aware of the fact that Islam believes that Christians are the closest to Muslims. In fact, the Koran states: "And the nearest among them in love to the Believers wilt thou find those who say, 'We are Christians': because amongst these are men devoted to learning and men who have renounced the world, and they are not arrogant." [*Surah V:82.*]

287. Mauritania, which upholds the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in keeping with the will of the international community, supports United Nations resolutions condemning Israeli occupation, and exploitation of the resources, of Arab territories. We condemn the invasion of Lebanon and the destruction of Beirut. We condemn the unjust policy of annexation carried out by Israel in the Syrian Golan Heights. We condemn most energetically the Sabra and Shatila massacres, which bring to mind the Deir Yassin massacre also perpetrated by Israel. We condemn Israeli terrorism against the inhabitants of southern Lebanon. And we also condemn the growing co-operation between Israel and racist South Africa to increase terrorism and exploit the Arab and African peoples.

288. We appeal for an end to any form of assistance to Israel, because that assistance is what encourages it in continuing its acts of aggression and expansion and its settlements policy. Any assistance to Israel, over and above the fact that it is unjust from the

standpoint of principle, might eventually force countries in the region into foreign alliances for reasons of self-defence—alliances they would not enter into if Israel were not given any assistance.

289. My country, like many others, believes that the occupation of Palestine is at the core of the question of the Middle East. Consequently, any solution must be comprehensive and must be based on Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem. The Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, must regain its legitimate rights, including its right to return to its homeland and to set up its own Palestinian State.

290. Although Israel is occupying territories, has succeeded in mobilizing a few Jews and caused the death of many innocent persons, and has been able to destroy cities and thwart development in the Middle East region, there is one thing which Israel has not been able to alter—the refusal of the peoples in the Middle East to recognize zionism and its régime in occupied Palestine.

291. Come what may, history will never be on Israel's side, and in the final analysis, Israel will have to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[2] Tirana, "8 NËNTORI" Publishing House, 1984.

[3] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1983*, document S/15556.

[4] *Ibid., Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[5] London, Shorouk International, 1983.

[6] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4*, document S/1296/Rev.1.

[8] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915), p. 100.

[9] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15403.

[10] *Ibid.*, document S/15317.

[11] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I, sect. A.

[12] *Ibid.*, chap. I, sect. B.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

76th PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 28 November 1984, at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: In connection with the Assembly's consideration of this item, three draft resolutions have been submitted [*A/39/L.19 and Corr.1, L.20 and Corr.1 and L.21 and Corr.1*].

2. Mr. OCHIENGHS-WELLBORN (Uganda): The Middle East crisis is one of the most formidable and intractable problems in the international arena. For four decades, the region of the Middle East has hardly known peace or tranquillity. Five wars have broken out, resulting in much destruction of lives and property. The grave situation in the Middle East is of concern to the whole of the international community, as it threatens world peace and security and could be the flash-point of big-Power confrontation.

3. The ramifications of the wars in the region have been felt all over the world. Therefore, as we approach the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we are reminded that the achievement of a peaceful solution to the Middle East crisis has been, and remains, one of the most pressing and challenging tasks on the United Nations agenda.

4. As the Secretary-General points out in his report:

> "The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East has followed a pattern that has become all too familiar. Each of the five destructive and inconclusive wars has been followed by a new peace effort, spurred by the renewed awareness of the dangers of continued stalemate. On each occasion proposals were put forward and in some cases partial agreement reached, but the peace effort soon became deadlocked . . . In time, the sense of urgency was lost and a deadlock was once again allowed to persist until the next major crisis." [*A/39/600, para. 35.*]

5. All the peace proposals have foundered because of Israeli intransigence, due in turn to Israel's avowed aim of frustrating the restoration to the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights.

6. It will be recalled that two years ago the brutal and totally unjustified Israeli invasion of Lebanon, with its attendant and horrifying massacres of Sabra and Shatila, jolted the conscience of the international community as a whole and made it realize the urgency of resolving the problem.

7. Even the United States has acknowledged that a comprehensive solution to the Middle East situation was necessary and must take into account the rights of the Palestinian people. Consequently, President Reagan outlined his peace initiative on 1 September 1982.[1] On 15 September 1982, the Soviet Union outlined its proposals for resolving the crisis.[2]

8. The Arab States as well as the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*] responded positively to the proposals for a just peace when they offered their peace plan, which was embodied in the Final Declaration of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982.[3] Despite the provocations of the unjustified Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the continued establishment of colonial settlements in the occupied Arab territories, they have stood by the offer of the Fez plan. That plan offers a basis for a just and lasting peace in which all States in the region could coexist within secure and internationally recognized borders. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, and the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly welcomed the Fez plan and called for an international peace conference on the Middle East.

9. Regrettably, Israel's response to these proposals was negative and provocative. It dismissed out of hand all the peace proposals from all quarters and proceeded to construct more settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

10. Ever since its inception, Israel has masked its designs and actions to acquire more Arab territories under the guise of its "concern for security within internationally recognized borders". Whenever it has been pressed to withdraw from occupied Arab territories under Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which it accepted, Israel claimed it was holding on to the territories for bargaining purposes only. An impression was given that it would withdraw from the occupied territories in the context of a comprehensive settlement, in exchange for recognition. Israel has rejected out of hand and frustrated all the peace initiatives not because they failed to provide assurances of security to all States of the region; Israel has rejected all these proposals out of hand precisely because they address the problem which is the core of the Middle East crisis. They call for the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

11. General Assembly resolution 181 (II), of 29 November 1947, from which Israel derives its existence, equally required the establishment of the Palestinian State. But ever since the adoption of that resolution by the General Assembly, Israel embarked on frustrating the realization of a Palestinian State while at the same time absorbing its territories in the

quest for Eretz Yisrael. It is in this context that Israel's actions and its rejection of the peace proposals should be seen by well-meaning people. The annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, the declaration of Jerusalem as the eternal capital, the invasion of Lebanon and the creeping annexation of the West Bank and Gaza through the implantation of colonial settlements are manifestations of the political course that has for decades been pursued by Israel.

12. The Arab population of the occupied territories is being systematically harassed, terrorized politically and economically, and persecuted with the clear objective of forcing it to flee into exile. Contrary to the injunctions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, Israel adamantly refuses to accept the applicability of the 1949 Geneva conventions to the occupied territories. Implicit in this stand is the false notion that these territories are part of Israel. This points to a clear design to annex the West Bank and Gaza.

13. It is Uganda's view that Israel continues to be intransigent because those who are in a position to do so have not applied sufficient pressure for it to comply with the Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Each aggressive war or action it has conducted has been followed by the infusion of yet more sophisticated weapons to intimidate its neighbours. The region has been transformed into a theatre for testing new and sophisticated weapons. We are dismayed when, instead of being concerned about the terrible suffering caused to the victims by the use of weapons, some relish or view with glee the success of the weapons emanating from their ideological camp. We in Africa view with concern the arming of Israel with sophisticated weapons beyond its defensive needs, in view of its military collaboration with racist South Africa, our sworn enemy.

14. Uganda has always viewed the essentials of a meaningful peace plan as a composite whole, each part being integrally related to the other parts. We have maintained that the conflict can be resolved only through a comprehensive settlement covering all its aspects. The United Nations must provide the framework for a just and comprehensive peace. A framework for peace can be just if it restores the rights of the Palestinian people and it can be comprehensive if it takes into account all the legitimate aspirations in the region and involves the participation of all the parties concerned.

15. Such a solution must include the following elements: first, the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories; secondly, the right of refugees to return to their homeland; thirdly, the exercise by the Palestinians of their right to self-determination.

16. Since the restoration of Palestinian rights constitutes the centre-piece of a settlement, it follows that the Palestinians, through the PLO, their sole and authentic representative, must necessarily be involved in the negotiations.

17. In this connection I wish to reiterate Uganda's support for an international peace conference on the Middle East called for by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine in 1983. We believe that there will be a greater chance for the success of a peace process in the Middle East if there is the participation of the Soviet Union, the United States, the PLO and all the other parties concerned on an equal footing. It is to us a matter of regret that the Secretary-General's efforts in convening such a conference have been frustrated by Israel, with the support of a reputable State Member of the United Nations. The Secretary-General states in his report:

> "As far as the proposal for a Middle East peace conference is concerned, I recall that the previous peace conference that met in December 1973, and of which the United States and the Soviet Union were co-chairmen, did in fact serve a useful purpose in relation to the arrangements that followed the 1973 war in the Middle East" [*ibid., para. 46*].

18. It is Uganda's firm view that the convening of such a conference would further advance the prospects for peace in the region. We call upon all concerned to give full support to the Secretary-General in this endeavour.

19. Mr. MAITHA (Kenya): The delegation of Kenya sees the origin of the unsettled situation in the Middle East as one created by the persecution of Jews in Europe during the Second World War and their desire to migrate to their alleged ancestral home in Palestine. The land to which they wanted to migrate was not devoid of inhabitants. Another people inhabited the area and also had ancestral ties to the land.

20. When, at the end of the Second World War, the question arose as to what to do with the Jews who had been persecuted in Europe, the General Assembly addressed the problem and in 1947 adopted resolution 181 (II).

21. By that resolution, the General Assembly created an Arab and a Jewish State in the former British-mandated territory of Palestine. Since that time, the region of the Middle East has been turned into an area of tension and war. The tragic events that followed the decision to partition Palestine are well known and I shall not take the time of the Assembly to recount them in detail. Those details are well documented and compose a history full of human misery. The core of the whole problem revolves around Palestine.

22. The United Nations, oblivious of the entirety of the implications of its decision, witnessed in 1948 a conflict that followed the partitioning of Palestine. The solution devised at the end of the conflict essentially took the form of humanitarian assistance. However important that aspect was, it should not have been construed as the final solution needed for the problems resulting from the partitioning of Palestine.

23. There were other dimensions to the problem, the solution of which was not addressed after the 1948 Arab-Israeli conflict. The failure of the United Nations to devise satisfactory solutions to all the aspects of the problem is proved by the fact that, in the past 37 years, the region of the Middle East has been devastated by five wars and countless breaches of the peace and of security. These unhappy events have arisen because of the unsatisfactory state of affairs in the region and the unresolved question of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights.

24. The General Assembly, at its twenty-ninth session, in 1974, in an attempt to find a suitable and just solution to the problem of the Middle East, departed from its past practice of looking only at the refugee aspects of the problem in the Middle East and instead started to look at it in its entirety. At that session, my delegation was happy to endorse the

inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly of the item entitled "The question of Palestine". We continue to believe that the question of Palestine demands urgent international attention until such time as a just and lasting solution of the problem has been found.

25. The twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly was a very important session in that it marked a political turning-point on the question of Palestine. It was at that session that the Assembly discussed for the first time in plenary meetings the question of Palestine. It was also at the same session that the Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the uprooted and dispossessed people of Palestine to self-determination and a homeland of their own. The session also recognized that the Palestinians were an indispensable party to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. My delegation is delighted to see that the Assembly did itself come around to accepting what should have been accepted and firmly upheld prior to the calamities that befell the people of Palestine in 1947 and 1948 and which have for so long disturbed the peace and security of the entire region of the Middle East.

26. We hold the view that the General Assembly, having taken the original decision to partition Palestine, must continue to find ways and means of resolving all the problems arising out of its own decision. What is needed is a comprehensive solution that is just, lasting and able to bring peace to the region.

27. At the centre of all the problems afflicting this unhappy region is the fate of a people, the Arab Palestinians. Though large Palestinian populations were uprooted, displaced and removed from their ancestral homes, their rights must in no circumstances be flouted, overlooked, sacrificed and/or minimized. These people have been scattered far and wide, but the majority still live in refugee camps not far from their known homelands and others live in the territories of neighbouring Arab States. They have not disappeared from the earth. Consequently, their right to a place of their own under the sun and in the country of their forefathers must never be an issue of dispute and should be urgently realized. It is time that the United Nations came to grips with the reality of the problem, that of restoring the rights of the Palestinian people. My delegation approaches the question of Palestine guided by the following principles: that the Palestinian people, the displaced Palestinian people, have a right to a homeland and, should they so wish, a State of their own in their ancestral lands, free, independent, sovereign and separate from the State of Israel; and that the Palestinian people have a right to participate in any forum that is convened to find solutions to problems affecting them.

28. With the adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) a process of negotiations was established. The process was further widened after the hostilities that broke out in 1973 and the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 338 (1973).

29. At the same time, the General Assembly, in resolution 3089 D (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, reaffirmed that the people of Palestine are entitled to exercise their right to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and declared that the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is indispensable to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

30. My delegation accepts the provisions of those resolutions and believes that, for a durable peace to be achieved, the Palestinians must be involved in the deliberations that affect their future. We call upon Israel to recognize that lasting peace will elude it as long as the displaced Palestinians are not listened to and fully involved in all negotiations and decisions affecting them.

31. We note with regret that, despite the many Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on the question of Palestine, Israel continues to ignore and defy the demands made in those resolutions.

32. Israel has been called upon to allow the return of Palestinian refugees to their homes and property and has defied that request, even to the point of militarily destroying refugee camps in areas over which it has no legal jurisdiction and which it has occupied by force of arms. Israel has been called upon to negotiate with the representative of the Palestinian people on an equal footing but has refused to do so.

33. Israel has been called upon to comply fully with the provisions of Security Council resolutions 465 (1980) and 478 (1980) and General Assembly resolution ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980. It has not done so. It is not only those resolutions that Israel has defied with impunity, but practically all Assembly and Council resolutions that have ever been adopted on the subject of Palestine.

34. The Kenya delegation's stand remains unchanged, and during the current session of the General Assembly Kenya will take a stand similar to the one it has taken before on this item. We cannot depart from our position of principle, in particular since Israel has continued to defy the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and by so doing has obstructed the attainment of the legitimate and inalienable right to self-determination of the Palestinian people.

35. In conclusion, we continue to uphold our position that Israel must withdraw from all Arab territories occupied since the June 1967 war. We simply cannot accept acquisition of territories by force, as in the case of Israel with respect to Palestine and other Arab lands. We will continue to reject, and object to, any assistance to Israel the purpose of which is to further Israeli intransigence and aggression against the people of Palestine and the Middle East as a whole. We will continue to condemn defiance of the international community by the State of Israel. Equally, we will continue to uphold the right of all States to exist within secure and recognized borders.

36. Mr. MBANZE (Mozambique): The question of the Middle East has been before the Assembly for more than three decades now. Needless to say, during this long period numerous resolutions and decisions have been adopted by both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

37. During the debate on this issue at the thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 38/180 D, in which it condemned, *inter alia*, Israel's continued occupation of the Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, and demanded once again that Israel withdraw immediately and unconditionally from all the territories occupied since 1967.

38. The fact that in 1984, at the current session of the General Assembly, the international community still has to make the same demand as that made in 1967 is indicative of Israel's intransigence and its total lack of respect for the Charter of the United Nations. While calling upon the United Nations to redouble its efforts in the pursuit of a just and lasting peaceful solution to the crisis in the Middle East, my delegation recognizes the role played by the Organization in the search for a just solution to the situation in the Middle East.

39. The responsibility for the continuing crisis in the Middle East rests with Israel and some Members of the United Nations which have prevented it from taking further appropriate measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, in particular those falling under Chapter VII.

40. The international community has been very imaginative in its endeavours to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Many proposals and initiatives have been put forward in this direction. Delegations which have spoken before us have made reference to those initiatives.

41. Israel has not only rejected those initiatives but, in its annexation of the eastern part of Jerusalem and its decision to extend Israeli jurisdiction and administration to the Syrian Golan Heights, also further violated the fundamental principles of international law. The tragedy in Lebanon is another glaring example of the stepping up of Israel's aggressiveness.

42. My Government views with great concern the increasing collaboration between Israel and the *apartheid* régime, as well as between Israel and some Member States, in so far as it undermines all peace efforts in the Middle East and encourages the régime to continue its militaristic, genocidal and expansionist policies.

43. My delegation joins other Member States in condemning this collaboration and in appealing to those States concerned immediately to cease their collaboration with the Zionist régime.

44. A just and durable peace cannot be established in the region except on the basis of Israel's total and unconditional withdrawal from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. A comprehensive settlement in the Middle East will also have to be reached through a just settlement of the Palestinian problem based on recognition of the legitimate and inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to establish their independent and sovereign State, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX).

45. The Arab peace plan,[3] adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, and supported by both the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, and the General Assembly, constitutes a sound framework for the establishment of lasting peace in the region. If Israel is willing to contribute to the promotion of a climate of peace in the region, it should consider abiding by the provisions of that plan.

46. My Government's position on the situation in the Middle East is well known. It has been reaffirmed time and again here in the United Nations and elsewhere. We strongly believe that peace in the region will result from the recognition by Israel of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of their own sovereign and independent State. We reaffirm our support of the PLO. Israel should withdraw its forces from the occupied Arab territories and respect and acknowledge the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the States in the area and their right to live in peace, free from the threat or use of force.

47. My Government reiterates its support for the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[4] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, as well as for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East.

48. My delegation wishes to commend the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 38/180.

49. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Yemen listened to the Israeli representative when he spoke here [*72nd meeting*] about problems in the Middle East, problems which crop up daily between brothers and between father and son within the bosom of the Arab family. He spoke about the war between Iran and Iraq; he spoke about misunderstandings between members of the single Arab family which stretches from one end to the other of the Arab world; and he spoke about what he called the occupation by Arab Egypt of Arab Yemen. However, he did not speak at all about the situation in the Middle East, which is the item under consideration, that is to say, the Arab-Zionist conflict.

50. Even if the Arabs have different opinions and take different paths towards the objective, in the final analysis they remain Arabs bound together by one interest and destiny—be they Jews, Christians or Muslims. The Jews of Yemen, for example, are Arabs just like the rest of the Arabs; they are bound to the Arab peoples by common ties of blood, parentage and heritage.

51. As for the Israeli representative with an American accent, who two days ago came here to speak in the Assembly, he is an intruding colonialist who does not belong at all to that good land. The Israeli representative's intention, as made plain in his statement, was to scorn the important activities of the General Assembly. He transformed serious and dangerous concepts into farce and irony. Does he feel no shame when he stands up with arrogance and vainglory to mock the activities of the Assembly, which bears major responsibility for Israel's creation? Does he feel no shame when he mocks the United Nations, the Organization born amidst the ruins of the Second World War which, as he said, took a toll of six million innocent Jews massacred by the arrogant Nazis who claimed that the Germans were a superior race and that Germany was above all other nations?

52. How similar today is to yesterday!

53. Since the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 38/180 on 19 December 1983, no noteworthy progress has been achieved towards a peaceful solution of the Middle East problem. The Syrian Golan Heights continue to languish under Zionist occupation. The inhabitants of southern Lebanon continue to suffer under the burden of occupation:

they are subjected daily to repression, terrorism and arrests, their homes are demolished, and they are banished from their homes and families. We fully condemn this abhorrent Zionist occupation of southern Lebanon, and we pay tribute to the heroic resistance of the courageous fighters, the sons of Lebanon, who are defending Lebanese soil, which is an integral part of Arab territories within the Arab world.

54. The inhabitants of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, both of which are occupied, have been no more fortunate than their brothers in the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. They, too, are subjected daily to acts of repression, terrorism, expulsion and arrests, in spite of all the relevant General Assembly resolutions, including resolution 38/79 B, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[5] is fully applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem.

55. Strenuous efforts have been made to formulate proposals and initiatives for the settlement of the Middle East question. The Arab initiative, embodied in the Final Declaration of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982,[3] still stands. There are other constructive and sincere initiatives and proposals, most important among which are those put forward by the Soviet Union and by the Secretary-General. But all those initiatives and proposals and all the enormous efforts which have been and continue to be deployed in good faith with a view to establishing a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East have had absolutely no effect on the State of Israel. Rather, that entity continues to ignore completely all those proposals and initiatives and to disregard the relevant General Assembly and Security Council decisions. It continues undeterred and with impunity to defy the will of the international community because of the political, economic and military support it receives from a great Power which bears an international responsibility, under the Charter of the United Nations, but has not lived up to that responsibility. The agreement on strategic co-operation between the United States and Israel is but one flagrant example of United States defiance of the decisions of the international community. That agreement goes against the interests of the countries and peoples of the Middle East region.

56. The question of Palestine is the core and crux of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Unless Israel recognizes the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to establish their independent State on their own soil, under the leadership of the PLO, no peace is possible in the Middle East. That is why Yemen welcomes the idea of a peace conference, to be attended, on a basis of equality, by all the parties concerned, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as by the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. The Yemeni delegation, which sees a gleam of light in the recent agreement between the two great Powers to reduce tensions in the world, has high hopes that this agreement to negotiate without pre-conditions on all questions—the most important of which are disarmament questions—will contribute in a positive manner not only to the special negotiations on disarmament but also to the efforts to resolve international problems by peaceful means and on an equitable basis, in conformity with international law.

57. The failure of the United Nations to solve the Middle East problem in all these years has indeed affected the credibility of the Organization and faith in its ability to solve international problems. The Yemeni delegation, which, as I have said, sees a gleam of light in this latest agreement between the two super-Powers, wishes them success in their efforts to solve international problems, success that would restore the prestige and credibility of the United Nations and its authority regarding the maintenance of international peace and security.

58. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): My delegation has read the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/600*] with great care and attention and would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of its scope and breadth. The issues raised in his observations not only represent an objective assessment of the complex and delicate situation in the Middle East but also should contribute to giving a renewed impetus to the international community's search for a durable peace for the region.

59. It must stir our minds to reflect that, since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, each of the five destructive and inconclusive wars, as pointed out in the report, has been followed by a new effort, spurred by renewed awareness of the dangers of a continuing impasse. It is therefore a challenge to the international community to exert its utmost efforts to break the chain and to ensure that the history of missed opportunities for achieving permanent peace and solving this intractable and grave problem does not repeat itself.

60. The foregoing not only stresses my recognition and perception of the increased tension in the Middle East but also underlines the great sense of the urgent need for the United Nations to push harder for a political settlement in order to save the region from the scourge of war. Indeed, it is evident that the situation, as we must recognize, becomes more dangerous each year with the increasing acquisition and introduction into the area of more sophisticated weapons.

61. Unfortunately, in spite of that destabilizing development, there has been no step forward towards peace in the past year because of the continuing Israeli failure to see the need to work towards peaceful accommodation with the Palestinians, who constitute the core of the problem. In fact, Israel has shown no willingness or desire to go beyond the Camp David agreement. We believe that a peace that is just and equitable cannot ignore the aspirations and the rights of the Palestinians. It must recognize their inalienable right to self-determination, to return to their homeland and to establish an independent State of their own in Palestine.

62. Israel persistently refuses to accept that the evident resolve of the Palestinians to establish their own homeland, as the Israelis have done, cannot be eliminated by intimidating military force. In fact, it was the erroneous belief that it could resolve the Palestinian problem by force on its own terms that led Israel into the first invasion of Lebanon in 1978. Its second invasion, launched in June 1982, was not differently motivated in spite of the claim that the invasion was intended to protect its northern borders. The horrifying massacre of innocent Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila camps which followed

that savage invasion could not but outrage the conscience of mankind.

63. Certainly, force cannot replace a political solution. The Palestinian problem still stares the Israelis in the face and remains as volatile as ever. Apart from the brutal force displayed by the Israeli occupation force, the invasion left a trail of destruction of human and material resources in Lebanon. It was another clear act of gross violation of the territorial integrity of Lebanon, in flagrant breach of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. For how long will the world continue to look on helplessly while Israel continues to defy the international community?

64. The Lebanese have categorically expressed their solemn desire to live in peace within secure boundaries. Israel's use of "security needs" to continue to prolong its illegal occupation of Lebanese territory demonstrates the arrogant intransigence and insensitivity that have characterized its attitude to the solution of the Middle East problem. It must, therefore, bear a heavy political and moral responsibility for the situation in Lebanon, where its excessive military action has left thousands dead, maimed or homeless. It bears a similar responsibility for persistently undermining international efforts to restore peace and stability in that country.

65. Regarding the situation in the occupied territory, my delegation is concerned over the reported increase in Jewish terrorism, particularly from the extremist Jewish Messianic movements. *The New York Times*, on 20 November of this year, quoted one Mr. Matar, a well-known Palestinian economist living in the occupied territory, as saying: "The extremism in Israel is causing people real fear." Continuing and referring to Rabbi Meir Kahane, the radical founder of the Jewish Defense League, he said:

> "Kahane, the popularity of the right-wing parties among the young, the Jewish terrorists, the attack on an Arab bus are all making us feel that we are not physically safe any more. There is a real fear within the Palestinian community that these crazies will undertake a major attack."

66. My delegation is aware of Israel's penchant for defying United Nations resolutions, but, in the light of the growing anxiety of Palestinian Arabs for their safety, Israel's attention must be drawn to the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.[5] In this connection, General Assembly resolution 38/79 B, of 15 December 1983, among other things reaffirmed that the Convention was applicable to Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem, and demanded that Israel acknowledge and comply with its provisions.

67. In the past seven years, Israel has systematically set out to establish new settlements in occupied Arab territories of the West Bank and Gaza as part of its design to consolidate its annexation of those territories. In all this, Israel has ignored international condemnation of its actions and the hardship they cause Palestinian Arabs, who are increasingly under pressure for holding land. Nigeria, therefore, reaffirms its support for General Assembly resolution 38/79 C, which demands that the Government of Israel desist forthwith from taking any action that would result in changing the legal status, geographical nature or demographic composition of the occupied territories.

68. My Government strongly holds the view that Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories not only is a flagrant challenge to the international community but also represents a serious threat to international peace and security. The world has witnessed in the past the futility of attempting to find a military solution or impose a lopsided super-Power solution to the Middle East problem. My delegation cannot but agree fully with the Secretary-General that: "Each succeeding war becomes more destructive because of the development of new and more sophisticated weapons. Far from resolving old issues, it creates new ones and widens the circle of resentment and mistrust among opposing parties." [*Ibid.*, *para. 36*.] The Israelis should ponder deeply over these words of wisdom, which stress the need for a determined effort to reach a peaceful settlement.

69. In the search for a political settlement, my Government's position calls for the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories occupied since 1967; the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon; the sovereign exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, including recognition of the right to self-determination, the right to return to their homeland and the right to establish an independent State in Palestine; the right of the PLO to participate fully in any international conference aimed at finding a just and lasting solution to the Middle East problem; and recognition of and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the region and their right to live in peace within recognized borders.

70. It is clear to my delegation that every opportunity should be explored to achieve a lasting and comprehensive solution under the auspices of the United Nations. In this respect, I recall that at the thirty-eighth session the General Assembly called for the convening of an international peace conference for this purpose [*resolution 38/58 C*].

71. My delegation regrets to learn from the Secretary-General's report that, in the light of the consultations he had conducted with the parties concerned, the members of the Security Council and other interested Governments, it is quite evident that the conditions required for convening the proposed conference with any chance of success are not met at the present time.

72. Nevertheless, my delegation has also noted the Secretary-General's belief in the special obligation of the United Nations to make another determined effort to find the means by which the United Nations can move forward to a negotiated peace in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). It seems to him that what is needed at present is a framework for negotiations and an umbrella under which the necessary contacts could develop according to the demands of the problems that were being considered.

73. While my delegation once again expresses its appreciation of the Secretary-General's report, it wishes to emphasize that no time, no opportunity and no opening should be lost in seeking a lasting solution to the Middle East situation. We regret that the co-operation needed for the implementation of the resolution adopted last year calling for this international peace conference has not been sufficiently forthcoming. We therefore call on all the

parties concerned to create the necessary conditions for the holding of the proposed international peace conference.

74. Mr. ALAUKLI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My country believes that the cause of the present situation in the part of the Arab world traditionally called the Middle East is the establishment of a Zionist base in Arab Palestine, a colonial settler base resulting from the Second World War. The Western colonial empires, exhausted by a costly global war, needed a resident agent to look after their economic and strategic interests in the Arab World. Those declining forces of imperialism found their instrument in the world Zionist movement, which accepted this role in return for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Arab Palestine. With these convergent objectives and interests, a deal was made and a racist entity was implanted in the heart of the Arab world, an entity which uses brute force to achieve the Zionist dream of establishing a greater Zionist State on the ruins of the Arab world.

75. As a result of these aggressive expansionist policies of the Zionist entity, the whole region has become the arena of a conflict of civilization between two opposites: the authentic indigenous party, which is fighting to preserve its independence and destiny, and the alien party, represented by the imperialist Zionist camp, which is trying through all means to conquer and crush the Arab nation. Five wars of aggression have been waged against Arab countries, resulting in the occupation of parts of their territories and in the death or uprooting of thousands of their citizens. They have had to mobilize all their capabilities in order to repel aggression and to resist pressure to bend the knee in surrender. In spite of the great imbalance of material might, the Arab position remained steadfast in its resistance until the Camp David accords, which in the Arab view are a deviation from the line of conduct of the Arab States and which caused Egypt to leave the arena of confrontation. The end result of those accords was a vindication of the logic of force and aggression. But the vitality of the Arab nation and its experience in struggle were able to limit the consequences of that deviation, which the Arab nation considered to be an odious Zionist-American model for peace. A second attempt was made to impose such a model on Arab Lebanon, but it was doomed to failure thanks to the blows struck by the heroes of the Lebanese national resistance.

76. It has been repeatedly stated that the basic problem is the continued Zionist aggression against the Arab nation and the programme of the Zionist base, which uses brute force and terror to achieve its expansionist goals. Zionist theory has it that the seizure of Arab territories constitutes a form of liberation of lands bestowed by God upon His chosen people, the Hebrews. That theory clearly reveals the true intentions of the leaders of the Zionist movement regarding the Arab world and helps us better to understand their perception of the political frontiers of their future empire. The terrorist Sharon has said that those frontiers will be spread as far as Israeli tanks can reach. The application of this expansionist theory brought about the occupation and annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights and the invasion of one third of Lebanese territory, as well as the accelerated establishment of settlements in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Egyptian Taba.

77. Moreover, the Zionist entity's new theories about so-called preventive war and the so-called security considerations of the Jewish State are nothing more than pettifoggery to attempt to justify the total use of military force to achieve its expansionist objectives. These theories also encouraged the Zionist entity to invade Lebanon in the summer of 1982 on the pretext of defending the security of Galilee. They also invoked these theories in the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear installations. Despite their claims, this action was intended to prevent the Arab nation from possessing nuclear power for peaceful purposes. These are only a few examples of the application of the Zionist theories of security; they show the true objectives of the Zionists: expansion through the absorption of more Arab territories and the destruction of the Arab world's entire potential for economic and social development, for such development would run counter to the schemes and requirements of the Zionist entity.

78. We are pleased to note that the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly over the years reveal increasing international awareness of the true nature of the conflict between the Arab nation and the Zionist entity, especially since the expansionist, aggressive schemes of the Zionist entity and of imperialism became clear. This is shown by the historic General Assembly resolution which declared zionism to be a form of racism [*resolution 3379 (XXX)*] and by the resolution characterizing the Zionist entity as a non-peace-loving country [*resolution ES-9/1*]. The Assembly has also denounced and condemned the collaboration between the two racist régimes, that in occupied Palestine and that in South Africa. The stand taken by the Assembly helps heighten our understanding of the true nature of the Middle East conflict and assists us in the search for comprehensive solutions which take into account the colonial and aggressive nature of the Zionist entity.

79. The Zionist entity's continued defiance of all United Nations resolutions demands that the Organization adopt suitable measures towards it, the same measures once adopted against the racist colonial régime in Rhodesia and which are now being applied against the racist régime in South Africa. There is no hope for fundamental internal changes in the policies or theories of such racist colonial régimes. We must therefore concentrate our efforts on the elimination of those régimes; their persistence runs counter to the principles of justice, right and peace.

80. The close relations between the United States Administration and the Zionist entity are one of the principal reasons for the increase of tension in the region. Comprehensive and unlimited United States assistance to the Zionist entity encourages it to continue carrying out its expansionist schemes and helps it to escape international sanctions. These relations have developed further since the signing of a strategic co-operation agreement which merges the capabilities of the two partners in the implementation of hegemonistic schemes against the Arab nation. The first practical application of this strategic co-operation was in Lebanon. During and after the invasion of that country, the world saw the extent of the co-operation between these two partners in the military, political and propaganda spheres. Despite the disappointing results of the Lebanese experience, the two partners were not discouraged in their military and political co-operation, which continues,

spreading even beyond the Arab region, to Africa, Asia and Latin America.

81. Figures published by various American institutions show the volume of military, economic and financial assistance received by the Zionist entity since the signing of this agreement, an agreement which has officially and legally transformed the Zionist base into a springboard of imperialism and a military base for United States Marines and for the United States rapid deployment force. This agreement's codification of the relations between the two partners makes the United States a direct party to aggression against the Arab nation. That role deprives the United States of the neutrality which it seeks to project in its mediation between the Zionist entity and some advocates of defeatist solutions in the Arab world. Consequently, any settlement which is brought into the world at the hands of the United States midwife will be no more than a document of surrender to Zionist conditions, on the pattern of the Camp David accords.

82. The question before us is closely related to the functions and purposes of the United Nations and to the mores and principles underlying the very concept of the international Organization. It is to be feared that the Arab peoples could lose confidence in the viability and credibility of United Nations resolutions as a result of the Organization's inability to carry out its functions due to the position of the United States Administration, which resorts to an arbitrary use of its veto power, paralysing the Organization and reducing the role of the majority of its Members to mere expressions of sympathy and good intentions.

83. The present conditions in the Arab region resulting from Zionist aggression against Palestine and neighbouring Arab countries place a heavy responsibility on the international community. All Member States without exception must shoulder that responsibility and remove the conditions which gave rise to this explosive situation. The Arab nation has not yet lost hope in the United Nations and is committed to supporting its efforts aimed at the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

84. I wish to comment on the statement made here two days ago [*72nd meeting*] by the representative of the Zionist entity. He uttered baseless allegations and lies in a malicious and cowardly attempt to distort the facts and divert the attention of the General Assembly from the item under discussion. The comparison he drew between Arab disputes and interactions, on the one hand, and the conflict of civilizations between the Arab nation and the Zionist entity, on the other, and his attempt to attribute the crisis to what he called the propensity to violence of the Arab race, are indeed expressions of the Zionist position of denying and distorting the facts and of applying Zionist racist theories which belittle the values of other races.

85. The representative of the Zionist entity was not able for one second to hide his racism, whatever his skill in lying and propagating disinformation. He was not able to produce a shred of evidence which could change the general conviction that the existence of the Zionist régime is contrary to the requirements of restoring peace and security to the region. Even more repugnant was that person's attempt to label others as terrorists when they defend their lands and destinies. He seems to forget that the Zionist entity represents history's most horrible form of terrorism.

86. I need not reply in detail to his allegations and lies. The international community replied correctly when it declared zionism to be a form of racism. In fact, we see in the massacres and acts of genocide in Sabra and Shatila and, before that, in Deir Yassin and Kafr Kassem, and in an electoral platform which permitted the terrorist Kahane to enter the Knesset, the best and most recent proof of the true nature of the Zionist scheme regarding the Arab nation.

Mr. Gumucio Granier (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

87. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of India who will introduce draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and Corr.1, L.20 and Corr.1 and L.21 and Corr.1.

88. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): I have the honour, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and Corr.1, L.20 and Corr.1 and L.21 and Corr.1. Like similar draft resolutions in previous years, these draft resolutions contain the basic principles for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East, principles already established and approved earlier by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

89. Draft resolution A/39/L.19 is a comprehensive resolution on the situation in the Middle East. While welcoming the world-wide support extended to the just cause of the Palestinian people and the other Arab countries in their struggle against Israeli aggression and occupation, it calls for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Middle East problem. It reaffirms the conviction that the question of Palestine is the core of the conflict in the Middle East and that no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region will be achieved without the full exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights and the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of Israel from all the Palestinian and other territories occupied since June 1967. The draft resolution reaffirms, further, that a just and comprehensive settlement cannot be achieved without the participation on an equal footing of all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people. The draft resolution stresses the great importance of the time factor in the endeavours to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It reaffirms its call for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East, as specified in paragraph 5 of the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[4] under the auspices of the United Nations and on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

90. Draft resolution A/39/L.20 condemns Israel for its failure to comply with Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and declares that its occupation of the Syrian Golan Heights constitutes an act of aggression under the provisions of Article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX). It also declares that Israel's decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the occupied Syrian Golan Heights is null and void and without legal validity, and emphasizes that this decision must be rescinded. While calling upon Member States to apply certain measures with a view to isolating Israel, the draft resolution reaffirms the necessity for total and un-

conditional withdrawal by Israel from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem, as an essential prerequisite for the establishment of a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East.

91. Draft resolution A/39/L.21 deals with the Holy City of Jerusalem. It declares that Israel's decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration on Jerusalem is illegal and therefore null and void and has no validity.

92. I have briefly enumerated the content of the three draft resolutions before the Assembly. I do not believe that there is any need to dwell at length on each of these texts since they all are self-explanatory.

93. The tragic conflict in the Middle East constitutes a grave threat not only to peace in the region but also to international peace and security. Recent months have witnessed a deterioration in the situation, resulting in further acts of aggression and intimidation by Israel of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. It is important to find an early solution to this conflict which has brought untold misery to millions of people, in particular the Palestinian people, who have been unjustly denied their basic and inherent right to self-determination and nationhood. The Secretary-General's report [*A/39/600*] states that the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East and its key issue, the Palestinian problem, have remained unresolved despite intensive efforts undertaken by the United Nations and individual Member States during the past 37 years. The primary reason for the lack of progress in finding a comprehensive solution is the arrogance and intransigence of Israel, which has deliberately defied the will of the international community.

94. India has consistently advocated that a just and comprehensive solution to the problems of western Asia should comprise the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national and human rights, including the right to establish an independent State in their homeland, the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and a guarantee that all States in the region, including Palestine, will be able to live within secure and recognized borders.

95. Along with other non-aligned countries, India has been active in mobilizing international support for a just, comprehensive and lasting solution of the Middle East problem on the basis of internationally recognized guidelines and principles. The support and solidarity with our Palestinian brothers and sisters has been a notable feature of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. In recent months our efforts have been concentrated on gathering support for the early convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, as proposed by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held in Geneva in 1983. The situation in the region does not brook any delay and preparatory measures should be undertaken with urgency so that the conference can be convened at the earliest possible time. In this context, we are appreciative of the efforts being made by the Secretary-General towards the convening of the conference and the consultations initiated by him with the parties concerned aimed at finding a comprehensive solution. We stand ready to extend our full support and co-operation in this connection.

96. I submit draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and Corr.1, L.20 and Corr.1 and L.21 and Corr.1 to the Assembly for consideration and adoption at a subsequent meeting convened for this purpose. I sincerely hope and trust that the draft resolutions will command the overwhelming support of the Assembly.

97. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): "O ye who believe! If a wicked person comes to you with any news, ascertain the truth, lest ye harm people unwittingly, and afterwards become full of repentance for what ye have done." [*Koran, Surah XLIX:6.*]

98. The situation in the Middle East has been described lucidly and fully by previous speakers, particularly by some of our Muslim brothers, and furthermore everybody knows what is happening in the Middle East; everyone knows the sad story of the occupation of Palestine, the Golan Heights, southern Lebanon and the West Bank, new settlements, and so on and so forth. There is nothing that is really unknown.

99. The repetition of these problems and the reiteration of the agony of the Middle East, which is indeed due to the Zionist invasion and occupation of Palestine, are due to a sad assumption—that the international consciousness at the United Nations is so sleepy, so irresponsibly playful, callous and sometimes devoid of an honest approach to issues that unless a case is constantly repeated it will simply remain forgotten.

100. That is the case, at least so far as the situation in the Middle East is concerned, and that is why people feel happy at least to keep the issue alive. This very attempt is an indication of the sad reality that this international body is the least trustworthy and that unless one keeps repeating one's case it will be totally forgotten and remain for ever disregarded. Whether this perennial remembrance will solve any problem or not is another matter, but it has been conceived as obviously necessary to repeat one's case continuously; therefore, people have been coming here every year with their "Mr. Presidents" and continuously repeating "the situation in the Middle East". If one goes through the speeches one comes upon exactly the same ideas, expressed with very little difference, for many years now.

101. Of course, when there is a Sabra and Shatila a new phase of the tragedy manifests itself; but there are always new phases and everywhere there are new incidents, new Sabras and Shatilas, to refer to, but the problem has always been the same.

102. Since our position regarding the issue of the Middle East and the Zionist invasion and occupation of Palestine—which is the kernel of all these problems—is quite clear, I had not intended to make a statement. However, when I heard the Zionist enemy, which unfortunately has been given recognition here and is able to have a seat among legitimate Members, trying two days ago [*72nd meeting*] to explain all the problems of the Middle East in terms of Arab violence and militancy, I thought it was necessary for me to remind the General Assembly of the verse I recited at the beginning of my statement: "If a wicked person comes to you with any news, ascertain the truth, lest ye harm people unwittingly, and afterwards become full of repentance for what ye have done."

103. I believe that all the cheap and dirty allegations and arguments produced by the representative

of the Zionist enemy are simply the best examples of the message in that Koranic verse. They are the arguments and tidings produced by an ungodly man, and we have to make clear their truth or falsity.

104. Our case—the case of the imposed war—has, regrettably, given this pretext to the enemy to exploit it against the interests of the entire people of the Middle East. Since we are the victims of that war and this Assembly knows of all its aspects—chemical warfare, attacks on civilians and so on—I think we are in the best position to clarify the matter and declare here that no one in the entire Islamic Republic of Iran believes that the imposed war is due to Arab violence or Arab militancy. On the contrary, we all believe that all wars in all parts of the world, particularly those in the Middle East, are imposed upon the many third-world countries by the imperialist and Zionist forces which are the policy-makers in many so-called super-Power States.

105. People in the Middle East are not suffering from Arab militancy; they are suffering from the Zionist invasion and infiltration. "Peace" is the most famous slogan of all Muslims. The greetings that they exchange are just that one word—"Salaam", "Peace be with you", "Salaam Alaikum".

106. It is very sad to see the agents of war, the agents of bloodshed and destruction, change their clothes, pretend to be peaceful and accuse the most peaceful people in the world of militancy and aggressiveness.

107. No honest member of a delegation—which means no member of a delegation—at the United Nations should accept the cheap and vulgar arguments produced by the Zionist representative.

108. I am not an Arab and as a matter of fact I personally hate nationalism because it has deceived some of our noble Muslim Arab brothers who might take some mythical pride in Arab nationalism.

109. They have forgotten, probably, the holy verse: "So lose not heart, nor fall into despair: for ye must gain mastery if ye are true in Faith." [*Surah III: 139.*]

110. As a non-Arab and strong opponent of nationalism, I feel duty-bound to elaborate upon the cultural dignity and historical magnanimity of the Arabs, who happen to be the victims of Zionist invasions.

111. The land of Arabia, indeed, is a land of sacred war. It is the most sacred land, that has within it the most sacred sanctuaries of mankind. As human beings, not as diplomats or representatives, we are all so indebted to the blessing of Allah and must be so thankful to him for sending to us his holy prophets, many of whom come from the same sacred land. Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohamed—may peace be on all of them—have brought the message of God and they all come from the same land.

112. The Arabic language is one of the strongest and, linguistically speaking, the most efficient languages. Those who know Arabic and have a very basic knowledge of mathematical logic and the symbolic section of the calculus propositions know very well that Arabic propositions are the closest and, I must say, best symbolic representations of their mathematical equivalents. There are many languages which are too primitive to be compared to the Arabic language. There are many such languages, some of them already recognized here, but those who are familiar with Arabic and linguistics know very well what the Arabic language is.

113. Arabic literature, in particular its Islamic part, is the best heritage of mankind. It is too rich and too sophisticated sometimes to be rendered into other languages. To give just one example, I refer to Nicholson, the greatest orientalist, who has written, and has translated many masterpieces of Arabic and Islamic heritage into English, who did not succeed in translating the text of *Fusous Al Hikam* written by Ibn Araby. He was almost through with the job when he came to realize that it was a failure and decided to give it up and not publish the translated part; he decided that those who want to understand that work must learn Arabic and read the text in the original or else remain for ever without knowledge of that great masterpiece. This is just one example, but there are so many more.

114. We believe that our world is indebted to the Arabic heritage, too indebted as a matter of fact to attack Arabs and produce such cheap and dirty arguments against them. Language is the most advanced and most sophisticated art of mankind. Indeed, abstract language is the most powerful and therefore the most advanced part of this art. Arabic art, as representatives know, has always been unique and confined to linguistic art, that is, poetry. Other cultures have in their fine arts visual concepts, such as we see in drawings, paintings or dancing. Even music is inferior in many ways to the abstractionist symbols of the Arabic language. That is why the beauty of Arabic music can show itself only when complemented and supported by Arabic poetry. Without Arabic poetry, Arabic music remains like any other music.

115. The abstract art of Arabic poetry and language remains unique and a great and valuable part of human culture. It takes more than what this General Assembly can offer to elaborate upon the Arabic heritage, Arabic art, Arabic poetry, Arabic prose and, indeed, the Islamic heritage that is written in the Arabic language. I will give another piece of evidence for those who are interested in culture. The greatest master of Koranic interpretation, Allameh Tabatabei, who passed away very recently, was an Iranian who spoke Turkish and Persian, and he decided to write his greatest masterpiece in Arabic because he rightfully thought that ideas and thoughts could be well put only in the Arabic language. Later, people tried to translate the voluminous work, which is in 25 volumes, into other languages, including Persian and English, but we have always believed that the Arabic version is more powerful and more accurate.

116. As for the Arabs themselves, I think members know a lot, but they need to know more or at least to remember more in order to sympathize more with them. They are renowned for their nobility, dignity and, in particular, hospitality. One arrives at an Arab's home and is treated as a prince, even if one is an ordinary person. But if one arrives at a Zionist home, one is treated as a beggar, even if one is a prince. At least, this has been our experience. More important than this is the fact that Arabs—that is, the primitive Arabs, the bedouins, the Arabs of the Sahara, those who are often looked down upon—are and have always been a better example of culture, maturity, hospitality and morality. Those familiar with the Arabic language and literature can appreciate and realize why in many moral and, in particular, in linguistic matters the authority is always the bedouin Arab, not the modern intellectual. As a matter of fact, it is the modern intellectual who can

be manipulated and deceived by Zionist agents, not the simple, genuine, decent, clean Arab.

117. Anyone who goes to Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Egypt or anywhere in the Arab land will see that these people have no differences, no difficulties. They are very friendly, very hospitable and very kind to each other and to the foreigner—who sometimes happens to cheat them.

118. Problems among the Arabs to which the Zionist enemy referred in his statement two days ago come from the Zionist invasion and occupation and, more than invasion and occupation, from the Zionist infiltration in the Arab land in particular and in the Muslim land in general. It is the Zionist conspiracies that have divided the entire Muslim land, particularly the Arab land, into small bits and pieces in the form of kingdoms, sheikhdoms and "figure-headdoms", which are happy with a small stone as a territory, a flag, a national anthem and some money to buy weapons from the Zionist industry. It is the Zionist enemy which is the core and cause of all our problems.

119. The problem is that the Arabs have been too hospitable and too kind and, therefore, received every disloyal, inhuman and unwanted guest and treated them on the basis of Arab hospitality, not on the basis of Zionist treachery and dishonesty. That is the problem.

120. Those dishonest terrorists who have invaded our region must shut their mouths. They are not in a position to tell us about Arab violence. The differences in our region are due to the Zionist and imperialist plots. It is they who have annihilated Palestine, have divided the entire Muslim world and created problems and more problems for all of us. And, as they themselves have said in their interviews with our brother Shaykh al-Islam, even the imposed war comes from them.

121. As for the Zionists' side of the argument, I think we need only quote their own authorities. There is a booklet—I am sure representatives have seen it—written by an honest Zionist who went to Palestine with the intention of permanently settling there but after some time decided that he could not endure the terror and corruption existing in that occupied land and returned to the United States and wrote his memoirs for you good people to understand what you are talking about and what you are deciding on. His name is Jack Bernstein, an Ashkenazi Jew who does not have that strong Zionist feeling or commitment to the so-called religious doctrine of zionism. I shall quote him, because he is a person who must be taken as an authority. I think he is honest and right. He knows about the internal issues and conflicts and the machinations of zionism more than anyone else.

122. The booklet is entitled *The Life of an American Jew in Racist Marxist Israel*. In a section entitled "Visitors to Israel", he writes the following:

> "Tourism is one of Israel's main sources of income. The largest group of visitors are American Jews. But there are also many American Christians who want to visit the holy shrines and to see the land of 'God's Chosen People'."

It is interesting that only the (atheist) Zionists claim to be God's chosen people.

> "These Christians come away very impressed and filled with religious fervour.
>
> "While in Israel, Jews and Gentiles alike are carefully watched so that they do not stray and happen to see the sordid side of Israel—the true Israel. Like in Soviet Russia"—this man believes that zionism and communism are basically the same—"and other communist countries, visitors to Israel are taken on carefully planned guided tours. They are shown the religious sites, the universities, the lush orchards, the technical accomplishments, the arts, and to stir sympathy they are taken to visit the Holocaust Museum.
>
> "But, kept from the eyes of the tourists are the ghettos, the prisons where political prisoners, mostly Arabs and Sephardic Jews, are subjected to the most inhumane forms of torture."

123. I must also recall and remind representatives that those experts who used to educate the agents of torture in the Shah's Administration were recruited from Israel. They were Israeli torture specialists who came to Iran and instructed and educated some of the secret police and members of the Shah's Administration in matters of torture. They are the experts, and they must definitely have exercised their expertise for the internal problems and so-called situations very efficiently.

> "The tourists do not see the widespread crime activities and the corruption and co-operation between organized crime bosses and government and police officials. The tourists do not learn of the true inner workings of Israel's Marxist/Fascist Government; nor do they see Israel's racism.
>
> "I met an American tourist who couldn't help telling me about the wonderful religious feeling she had from just being in Israel—the Holy Land. I remarked to her: 'Just try giving a Bible to a local Jew and you will see how much religion and religious freedom there is in Israel. If seen by the police, you will be arrested.'"

124. About religion in Israel, he writes:

> "The land on which the present State of Israel has been built, formerly Palestine, was once walked upon by Moses, Jesus and Mohamed.
>
> "Since Palestine was the site of many religious events and has many religious sites, it is rightfully referred to as the Holy Land. So, one would think that Palestine, now Israel, would tend to have an air of holiness about it.
>
> "When Palestinian Muslims and Palestinian Jews occupied Palestine, there was a religious aura. But, since the Zionists took over the area and set up the State of Israel, it is one of the most sinful nations in the world where only about 5 per cent of the Jews are religious. It is interesting to note that those who are strongly religious are Arab Muslims and Arab Christians who make up a small minority in Israel."

The Zionist—he is from the inside—says:

> "Israeli laws suppress all religion. For instance, it is against the law to try and convert a Jew to another religion, even if the Jew is an atheist or a humanist. A Christian is permitted to preach the gospel in a church building, but for the clergy, for anyone, even to tell anyone about the teachings in the Bible outside the church building will bring a five-year prison sentence. For a Christian to give a Bible or other religious article to a Jew will also bring a five-year sentence. Even an act of kindness by a Christian towards a Jew, such as giving a gift

> of food, can be interpreted as trying to convert the Jew to Christianity and can bring a five-year prison sentence."

Poor Jews!

> "This same law of religious suppression applies to those of the Islamic faith who in an act of kindness give a gift of any kind to a Jew. A five-year prison sentence can result.
>
> "The treatment of religious Jews is touchy for the ruling Zionists. World-wide, Jews and non-Jews view Israel as a land where Jews may practise their religion without persecution. Therefore the Zionists do not dare risk suppressing Judaism for fear of arousing world opinion against them, so the ruling Zionists merely tolerate the religious practices of the small minority of religious Jews in Israel."

125. Later, the writer tries to give a warning to the American people, to the American taxpayers, who are supporting Israel without knowing what they are supporting. It is not simply out of ignorance; it is partially due, with all respect, to the determining role that the Zionist agents can play in the American Administration. This is headed "A warning to Mr., Mrs. and Miss America" and he says:

> "The Marxist Zionists who rule Israel and the Marxist Zionists in America have been trying to trick the United States into a Mid-East war on the side of Israel, of course. They almost succeeded when United States Marines were sent to Lebanon in 1982. The blood of the 250 American Marines who died in Lebanon is dripping from the hands of the Israeli and American Zionists.
>
> "If more Americans are not made aware of the truth about Zionist/Marxist Israel, you can be sure that, sooner or later, these atheists who claim to be God's Chosen People will trick the United States into a Mid-East war against the Arabs who in the past have always been America's best friends."

That is the recommendation and the observation of an honest Jew. About the crimes in Israel he says:

> "Since Israel (formerly Palestine) is the land where Moses, Jesus and Mohamed once walked, it would seem the inhabitants of this land would have respect for this holy land and for the religious sites that exist.
>
> "Nearly all Arab Muslims and Arab Christians do have respect, even reverence, towards the holiness of the land; but only a small minority of the Jews have this same respect. Ninety-five per cent of the Jewish population are atheists or secular humanists and are not held back by the 10 commandments or other restraints on sinful human behaviour.
>
> "When the Zionist/Bolshevik Jews won control of the 'Holy Land', every form of sin began seeping into this land. Within a few short decades, this holy land became a modern-day Sodom and Gomorrah. Drug trade, drug abuse, illegal weapons sales, prostitution, gambling, labour racketeering, murder, extortion, blackmail, insurance fraud, loan sharking and corruption of Government officials and police.
>
> "Israel has a highly organized crime syndicate, headquartered in Bat-Yam near Tel Aviv. Many members of the crime syndicate are ex-convicts and ex-commandos from the Israeli army and they are highly skilled in the use of weapons and explosives."

This is only in that part of the world; it does not happen anywhere else. Therefore, representatives have to realize where all these crimes are exported from. He goes on:

> "The crime syndicate in Israel operates openly because of corruption in Government and police circles. Some of the police and Government officials are paid off by the crime syndicate and some officials are actively associated with the crime operation.
>
> "The average American doesn't hear of this, the real side of Israel, because the Zionist controlled press, radio and TV in America keep silent about it. But in Israel some newspapers report the facts. For instance, right in the middle of page 1 of one of the Hebrew-language newspapers a couple of years ago was an article that said in effect that what the Italian Mafia couldn't accomplish in 40 years, the Israeli Mafia accomplished in five years. It has developed the largest illegal drug exporting ring in the Mid-East, selling drugs mainly to Germany and the United States. They have even set up a distribution network within Germany and the United States."

126. The whole of this article and many other articles of this nature give a very modestly objective picture of the nature of zionism, whose representative comes here to attack Arabs on the charge of Arab violence. It is a shame, is it not?

127. The Zionist problem in the Middle East is not simply a political problem or a military problem; it is a fundamental moral and religious problem; it is a centre of corruption. The people of the Middle East can get rid of this centre of corruption only when the centre is eradicated and those Ashkenazi Jews who travelled to Palestine with mythical dreams go back to their beautiful homes in London and Paris and New York. The Middle East belongs to the Middle Eastern people.

128. I must reiterate that all those resolutions and decisions which implicitly or explicitly recognize this base of corruption, or which exempt those pieces of lands which were occupied before 1967 and begin the argument from 1967 onwards, and all those decisions and resolutions which require implicitly some sort of peaceful settlement in which all parties, including the centre of corruption, the Zionists, will participate, are not only unworkable, not only against the interests of the Palestinians, but against the interests of the entire people, against the interest of Muslims and against Islam. They are not going to work. The General Assembly should not waste its time on them.

129. The solution is very simple. A group of Ashkenazi Jews have come and occupied a piece of our territory, our region, our Islamic land. Please, ask your friends to leave the area and leave the rest of the problems to us. Let us solve our own problems. We do not want your help. Whatever we say, let us solve our own problems. The Zionist agents, who make the foreign policy of many of the super-Powers, come and say: "The Islamic revolution is going to eat you up. You must support Saudi Arabia or Kuwait or Jordan against Islam"—not knowing that Jordanians, Kuwaitis and Saudi Arabians are already Muslims. It is the American imperialist Zionist interest that is threatened by Islam and by the Islamic

revolution, not the Arabs of Saudi Arabia, or Kuwait or Jordan—none of them.

130. This argument must be stopped once and for all. We think that the final solution to the problem of the Middle East is a very simple solution. We must restore the legitimate Government of Palestine, which has been annihilated once by the Ashkenazi Jews who came to the area as unwanted guests. They must go.

131. When the flag of Palestine is waving over the entire land of Palestine, it will soon be seen that there is no problem in the area.

132. In this context, the American people must remember that once in the history of the Middle East they were respected. That was when they did not support Israel.

133. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), dated 22 November 1974.

134. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): At the outset, I wish to thank all the representatives who have spoken in support of the sincere call for peace and of the efforts of the Secretary-General to ensure the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly in order to achieve peace in the Middle East. Those were not mere statements uttered in this Hall, but a declaration of their commitment to peace through justice and the reaffirmation of that commitment.

135. In their statements, the representatives have reported in detail and at great length. They have expressed their concern and alarm over the unceasing brutality of the occupying Power, Israel, and the suffering of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples under Israeli occupation.

136. The international community demands, and should demand, an end to Israel's aggression and the termination of its occupation of our homeland, our territory.

137. We noted with great satisfaction the principles pronounced by President Mitterrand of France on 27 November 1984. One of those principles of French policy refers in particular to the Palestinian people and is in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. In that statement, President Mitterrand said: "Then there is the right of all peoples, in particular the peoples of the region, to a homeland where they can develop the structures of their choice. This applies especially to the Palestinian people."* From that statement the position of France regarding the Palestinian State and the choice of the Palestinian people is very clear. That is a principle that the world should bear in mind and really apply.

138. The most notable aspect of the situation in the Middle East is the Arab-Israeli conflict.

139. We have studied carefully the reports of the Secretary-General [*A/39/533, A/39/600 and A/39/130 and Add.1*]. The observations made by the Secretary-General in his reports are of great significance. Let me state immediately that the PLO greatly appreciates the endeavours and efforts of Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar. He has done and continues to do the utmost in his limited power. It is the response and the co-operation of Member States that facilitate implementation and we cannot really demand too much from the Secretary-General. However, we have noted with surprise the observation in which he blames all the parties to the conflict and blames them equally: "On each occasion proposals were put forward and in some cases partial agreement reached, but the peace effort soon became deadlocked because of the intransigence of one party or another" [*A/39/600, para. 35*].

140. Analysing the real situation, we wonder if Security Council resolution 338 (1973) was not a mechanism to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in which both the aggressor and the victim in 1967 agreed on a modality for reaching a peaceful solution. And was it not Israel which violated every single provision of Security Council resolution 242 (1967)? Resolution 242 (1967) was doomed to failure because Israel utilized it as a stepping-stone for the next act of aggression. Moreover, resolution 242 (1967) addressed an exigency, a state of war, but completely ignored the core of the conflict, namely, the question of Palestine, the destiny of the Palestinian people and the occupied Palestinian territory.

141. Notwithstanding the acceptance of resolution 242 (1967) by the Arab side in the 1967 Israeli aggression, Israel failed to carry out any of its provisions. In our opinion, the Government of the United States gave its interpretation of resolution 242 (1967), in so far as it affects the Palestinian people, when it declared from this rostrum that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) did not address the political dimension of the Palestinian problem.

142. We felt certain then that the United States Government was about to overcome its intransigence and contribute to the search for peace in the Middle East and to putting an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict through a just solution to the Palestinian problem, by addressing the political dimension, by redressing the injustices, by recognizing the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, and by respecting those rights. Unfortunately, the United States has not taken any further action.

143. On 1 October 1977, the two co-Chairmen of the Geneva peace talks—the Soviet Union and the United States—issued a joint statement calling for the resumption of the talks. The PLO expressed satisfaction and hope. But it was the United States which reneged, and it is the intransigence of the United States that has undermined—not merely deadlocked—the process of peace. We note with gratitude that the Soviet Union adheres to its position and still supports all endeavours for a comprehensive settlement. That has been noted clearly in the report of the Secretary-General.

144. Partial agreement was reached in one area. This was an agreement the General Assembly considered to be null and void in so far as it purported to determine the future of the Palestinian people and of the occupied Palestinian territories. Israel maliciously used that partial agreement to launch a major offensive against Lebanon. It repeated its aggression by invading Lebanon. The Israelis claimed that the invasion was launched to destroy the PLO's infrastructure and to eliminate the Palestinian armed elements. The United States Government subscribed to the "elimination of Palestinian armed elements", to quote a statement made in the Security Council by the United States representative. Note that that representative speaks of the elimination of human

---

*Quoted in French by the speaker.

beings. The elimination of human beings, armed or otherwise, is a Nazi method; it is a form of genocide.

145. And now, in Lebanon, it is clear that the future of the Lebanese people and the Lebanese territory will be used as a bargaining chip in other ongoing deliberations under the aegis not of the United Nations, but of the United States Government. We are confident—we know—as has been clearly stated here—that the Lebanese people and Government will not permit such a game. The Prime Minister, Mr. Karamé, has firmly set out the Lebanese position and Lebanon's determination to defend its independence and sovereignty.

146. Moreover, the General Assembly has endorsed the call to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East and has invited the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to participate, along with the Soviet Union and the United States. The Secretary-General tells us in his report [*A/39/130 and Add.1*] that it was clear from the replies of the Governments of Israel and the United States that they were not willing to participate in that peace conference. They were not willing to discuss peace, and approaches to peace.

147. Thus, it becomes clear that it is not the "intransigence of one party or another", but the policy and deliberate obstruction of the Governments of the United States and Israel that undermine peace proposals and efforts.

148. The PLO firmly adheres to the call made by its Chairman, Yasser Arafat, at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983: the call for the convening of an international peace conference.

149. We fully concur with the conclusion arrived at by the Secretary-General that the Arab-Israeli conflict can be resolved only by a comprehensive settlement, covering all its aspects, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions—not selected resolutions.

150. The United States Government persists in its support of Israeli policies and practices, whether expansionism through military adventures and aggression against neighbouring Arab States, or escalated repression of the Palestinians in the occupied Palestinian territories.

151. The United States Government has even institutionalized its campaign of terrorizing and intimidation: a clear case of State terrorism. It has adopted a law, Public Law 98-151, of 14 November 1983, which reads in part:

> "Not later than January 31 of each year, or at the time of the transmittal by the President to the Congress of the annual presentation materials on foreign assistance, whichever is earlier, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a full and complete report which assesses, with respect to each foreign country, the degree of support by the government of each such country during the preceding twelve-month period for the foreign policy of the United States. Such report shall include, with respect to each such country which is a member of the United Nations, information to be compiled and supplied by the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, consisting of a comparison of the overall voting practices in the principal bodies of the United Nations during the preceding twelve-month period of such country and the United States, with special note of the voting and speaking records of such country on issues of major importance to the United States in the General Assembly and the Security Council, and shall also include a report on actions with regard to the United States in important related documents such as the Non-Aligned Communiqué. A full compilation of the information supplied by the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations for inclusion in such report shall be provided as an addendum to such report. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this subsection shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance to a country which the President finds, based on the contents of the report required to be transmitted under this paragraph, is engaged in a consistent pattern of opposition to the foreign policy of the United States."[6]

152. Is this not State terrorism against the Members and the very institution of the United Nations? How much more could anyone bully the United Nations? They are institutionalizing their terrorism against the United Nations.

153. That same law donates to Israel no less than $910 million in so-called economic support—for which we may read more Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories. The law grants $850 million for military education and training and $300 million for research and development by the Israelis in the United States, and an additional $250 million for the procurement of defence articles and services.

154. The role of the United States Government, in its determination to impose a *Pax Americana* through strategic military alliances and in its annulment of the role of the United Nations and its endeavours for peace, is very clear.

155. The PLO calls upon all Member States and the rest of the international community to join in and contribute—to the extent each is able—with the aim of convening the international peace conference, as called for in the relevant resolutions. That is the only path to peace.

156. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In conformity with resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950, I call on the Observer of the League of Arab States.

157. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): The Middle East question concerns basically the issues and problems that arise from the Arab-Israeli conflict. Some of these issues become more complex, and apparently intractable, as a consequence of Israeli intransigence and the nearly blind support that Israel receives from the United States. This situation renders the Middle East crisis-prone and has an adverse impact on the future of stability and peace in the region and throughout the world.

158. Since the Assembly's thirty-eighth session, several developments have taken place in the Middle East; they are germane to this debate and should be recorded and explained.

159. The first development was the abrogation of the 17 May agreement, forced by Israel upon Lebanon. This development constituted an important step towards the healing of Lebanon's wounds and brightened the prospects for Lebanese national cohesion. The 17 May agreement was divisive and tended to legitimize negotiations conducted under the duress of

occupation. It absolved Israel of its wanton invasion of Lebanon and its contemptuous rejection of Security Council resolutions.

160. Furthermore, the abrogation of the 17 May agreement made it clear that separate "peace" agreements, besides being a violation of the League of Arab States charter, weaken the negotiating position of individual Arab States. The earlier separate agreement that was brokered by the United States and is known as the Camp David accords regrettably led to Egypt's temporary suspension from the councils of the Arab League. As a consequence of the abrogation of the 17 May agreement, the Camp David accords have become more vulnerable. Opposition to them has become more outspoken and effective and eventually will be of more consequence.

161. What must be emphasized is the fact that so-called agreements "negotiated" under the duress of occupation and brokered by a super-Power are reversible. This reality should not be, as it has been, construed in terms of a "set-back" or "success", but should be construed in terms of improving the opportunities for a comprehensive Middle East peace. The righting of a wrong formula, or a wrong agreement, must be welcomed and should not be a cause for brooding. True, the situation in Lebanon remains tenuous but, equally true, the prevalent thrust is towards national unity, institutional reform and credible opportunities to exercise the prerogatives of full sovereignty.

162. Israel's continued procrastination about expediting its withdrawal from Lebanon, and the heightened level of its inhuman practices against the population in the occupied territories—as manifested yesterday by the arrest of more than 50 persons in the South—have brought about the heroic Lebanese resistance, of which the Arab woman and the Lebanese woman from the South who demonstrated in a vigil in front of the United Nations were an expression. This has put Israel on notice that continued occupation of southern Lebanon will be increasingly costly and that resistance in the South is rapidly becoming a catalyst of Lebanon's national will.

163. The second development, related to the first, is what is taking place within Egypt. At earlier sessions I explained in detail the reasons for the Arab League's strong opposition to the Camp David accords. What is new is the growing level of opposition to those agreements inside Egypt, on the official and unofficial levels. This has been demonstrated by the universality of the Egyptians' boycott of the so-called normalization aspect of the Camp David accords. Widespread frustration manifests itself in the growth of political parties that reinforce the awareness that the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel was but a smoke-screen and a licence for Israel to proliferate settlements in the West Bank and Gaza, annex Jerusalem, annex the Golan Heights, invade Lebanon and render the Camp David accords a pretext for Israel's rejectionist policies and a way to buy time in order to annex more territories, conduct more aggression, deny more rights, trample on more United Nations resolutions and defy more imperatives of international law and civilized behaviour.

164. Egypt, conscious of its role within the Arab nation and aware of the trap that the Camp David accords constituted, has moved to distance itself from those accords, although it is not yet ready to extricate itself from their suffocating hold. Only when Egypt regains its full deterrent functions can it resume its full natural and national role in the Arab national community. This, it must be understood, is our hope and our purpose.

165. The third development is the evolving pattern of the United States-Israeli strategic co-operation agreement. Though this strategic co-operation has been a constant in United States-Israeli relations, it has during the past year taken on a more assertive character. Israel has extracted from the United States a degree of permissiveness that is alarmingly provocative of Arab feelings, besides being in many ways damaging to Arab interests and national rights. In the United Nations, the United States has shielded Israel from the logical consequences of its aggression and violations. While the world community has condemned Israel's behaviour and its practices in occupied territories, the United States not only has refrained from joining in the international consensus but has sought to prevent it from emerging and has even stifled its expression. Even when the Security Council sought, in an excessively mild resolution, to reaffirm the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War[5] and demanded that Israel lift all restrictions so that normal conditions could obtain, the United States vetoed the resolution. The United States thus provided Israel with unprecedented immunity, never enjoyed to this extent by any aggressor. What the United States did in this case was what it had done in earlier cases—that is, enable Israel to do what it wants, whenever it wants, wherever it wants.

166. Intoxicated with its characteristic arrogance and prior assurance of United States protection for any of its actions, Israel has become emboldened in its defiance of and contempt for United Nations resolutions. Since Israel can persuade the United States that it is its only "reliable" ally and its strategic instrument in the region, Israel can guarantee for itself an unremitting flow of military and economic assistance that sustains its expansion, its policies of annexation and its continued violation of Arab territorial sovereignty and Palestinian national and human rights.

167. The question arises about the "ease" with which the United States is persuaded by the Israeli thesis. That Israel would want a free hand to achieve its racist and expansionist designs is to be expected, but the United States response is not. Herein lies the major cause of the critical phases in United States-Arab relations and the continued instability in the Middle East region.

168. The strategic agreement between the United States and Israel shields the latter from the international consensus and protects it against the sanctions necessary to restrict its addiction to expansion and aggression. The strategic agreement does more, as it is predicated on two assumptions: first, a United States commitment to Israel's qualitative military superiority over Arab States, and, secondly, Israel's direct impact on the political equations within the United States. Translated into concrete policies and attitudes, this means that United States criticism of Israel's behaviour or policies—and such criticism is getting rarer—is not matched by any inhibiting action or follow-up. Suffice it to mention the Reagan plan of 1 September 1982[1] and Israel's outright rejection of it, and the United States permissiveness during Israel's invasion of Lebanon. Even when the

President of the United States requested Israel to freeze its settlements, Israel's answer was to establish new ones instantly and to beef up the existing ones. These facts are so well known that they require no further elaboration.

169. What might require explanation are the reasons for this United States abdication of objective judgements in order to placate an Israel on the loose and Israeli practices that are so inimical to United States values, policies, interests and expected role.

170. We shall not try to undertake here this task of explanation. There is growing evidence that many in the United States are beginning to see through this massive cover-up of Israel's role in debilitating United States capability and credibility in the region. Americans, not only in the constituency of conscience but also among the pragmatists, are freeing themselves from the fear of being called anti-Semitic when they criticize Israel or oppose its policies or the huge military and economic assistance it receives.

171. Welcome as the emergence of such elements among policy- and opinion-makers is, we cannot exaggerate their actual influence and their eventual impact. What can be ascertained is that the well-established Israeli lobby no longer has an exclusive claim on determining United States policy direction in the Middle East or opinion-making. That having been said, it is still incumbent upon us to avoid false hopes or to indulge in wishful thinking.

172. But now that the United States elections are over and the auction of favours to Israel among candidates no longer mutes a genuine debate on issues pertaining to the United States position on the Middle East, it is only logical to expect from the United States much more than the voting duet with Israel in the General Assembly which, with sad bewilderment, we observed so frequently.

173. It might be said that an analysis of the United States role here is disproportionate compared to other sectors of the world community. There are obvious reasons for this focus.

174. First, the United States is one of the two super-Powers with special global responsibilities towards international peace and security. The United States has sought to play an exclusive role in conflict resolution and to deal with the Middle East issues unilaterally. The net outcome of this approach led to the exclusion of the United Nations from playing its expected role and to dissipating the input of the world community, thus minimizing its relevance and potential for constructive contribution.

175. Secondly, the special United States relationship with Israel was marketed so as to impress upon the international community that the United States would exercise its special leverage to render Israel more compliant with the international will and consensus. What has taken place, except in a few instances, is that the United States aided Israel's efforts to paralyse the international consensus and avoid accountability.

176. Thirdly, the United States view of the Middle East issues in terms of super-Power competition or confrontation led it to ignore the basically regional and local grievances that flow from Israel's conquest, continued occupation of territories, annexionist policies and racist practices. This in turn meant that the United States could not judge issues on their merits, but on whether they served the strategic priorities of the cold war.

177. Fourthly, the United States has developed a proclivity to consider "separate agreements" sought by Israel as "windows of opportunity". Whatever might have been the motives of the United States to undertake this approach, they have led to further instability in the Middle East.

178. The United States failure to appreciate the determinant role of inter-Arab relations resulted in the United States Administration agreeing with Israeli assumptions and thus in many instances viewing developments in the Middle East through Israeli eyes and without question, although distancing itself at times from the more embarrassing excesses of Israel's behaviour and practices.

179. We in the Arab nation have for many historical and intellectual reasons relied on a United States ability to be even-handed only to see this being interpreted as a willingness on our part to be hostages to United States bias towards Israel. When the Arabs presented the world with the peace plan embodied in the Final Declaration of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982,[3] the United States treated our commitments to genuine peace as a potential disposition to passivity. The United States assumed that it could do little about Israeli intransigence—some Americans justified it, others simply accepted it, few were critical of it. This United States assumption led it to put pressure on the Arabs to make concessions when our collective reasonableness and moderation were expected to induce the United States to exert pressure on Israel.

180. I do not want to dwell any further on the paradox of the United States position and policies on the Arab-Israeli conflict. Suffice it to mention that the Arab States emphasized that there are points of convergence as well as divergence with the Reagan plan of 1 September 1982.[1] Israel rejected the Reagan plan outright. The United States dismissed the Arab League's Fez plan and enhanced the substantive aspects of its strategic co-operation with Israel.

181. The United States requested Israel to freeze its settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. Israel built more settlements in its creeping annexation of those areas. The United States increases its military aid to Israel and creates task forces to save Israel from economic collapse. The paradox becomes more paradoxical.

182. The United States, which claims that it adheres to the principle of self-determination, makes a specific exception of the Palestinian people as if this principle is inapplicable to them. A hue and cry is raised in the United States about any disgruntled Soviet Jewish citizen claiming that his human rights have been violated, while in regard to southern Lebanon, where a whole population's human rights are being systematically violated, the United States vetoes a simple draft resolution seeking to protect those rights.

183. The Middle East question cannot be discussed except in a much wider context. Developments in the Middle East region invariably influence what takes place in the wider field of international relations in the same manner as the events in the region are influenced by them. The interaction between the regional and the global is not only inevitable but very much felt in the Middle East itself.

184. Herein lie the challenge and the opportunity. What has taken place recently in the global context can be viewed as a positive evolution. The recent

announcement by both the United States and the Soviet Union of the forthcoming meeting to discuss, albeit in a preliminary stage, issues of disarmament will, we hope, contribute towards a global relaxation of tension.

185. As far as the Middle East is concerned, this means that a new opening is conceivable for an authentic, comprehensive and just peace.

186. In other words, in order to seize this opportunity it is crucial that the international peace conference recommended by the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly and proposed by the Secretary-General be defined more precisely and efforts to convene it be pursued more vigorously.

187. We in the League of Arab States are keen on making a contribution towards this goal. The proposed conference has the advantage of focusing on the causes and problems that are the crux of the Middle East tensions and crises. This means that problem-solving will be removed from the overriding imperatives either of the cold war or of super-Power competition for influence or projection of power.

188. This is a propitious moment for the Secretary-General to reinvigorate his initiative concerning the convening of this conference. Perhaps some of the objections the United States raised in the midst of a Presidential election would no longer stand the test of a more objective criterion. The United States furthermore undoubtedly will realize the benefits of a broader and comprehensive approach and a more collective participation. Insistence on unilateralism in this matter has proved counter-productive and inimical to the declared objectives for which various initiatives were undertaken.

189. Israel's outright rejection of the convening of an international conference only reinforces our belief that Israel will continue to try to veto this proposal as long as it is assured of the prior United States guarantee that this adamant refusal would not be diplomatically, militarily or economically costly. We are convinced that the United States can act upon its judgement and the requirements of its responsibility. This will signal to Israel that its tantrums will not inhibit the United States from pursuing its policy objectively and even-handedly.

190. The proposed international conference, as noted in the Secretary-General's report, will be within the United Nations framework. That it is supported by a super-Power like the Soviet Union should not preclude studying the proposal on its procedural as well as its substantive merits and should be an incentive to make the process of resolving the Middle East problems a broad, international shared effort instead of being a cause for international friction.

191. We are aware that nuclear disarmament has top priority on the agenda of the forthcoming meeting of Mr. Shultz and Mr. Gromyko. If this can lead to relaxation of fixed positions on the Middle East, the realism of the Secretary-General would be acknowledged and appreciated.

192. The Arab States at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, clearly spelt out a viable Arab consensus. We have sought to make our position in tune with the requirements of the international consensus and the resolutions of the United Nations. Our position since the Fez peace proposal and resolution has been clear, consistent and corresponding to what the international community defined as legitimate rights and the fundamentals for a just and durable peace, the assumption being that only a just peace is durable.

193. The year 1985 ought to be the year when the Middle East problem is addressed thoroughly and decisively. There is a convergence of factors that renders this option feasible and achievable. We must seize the opportunity. The modalities provided by the Secretary-General's report constitute a relevant vehicle and the United Nations the proper framework. If this can be obtained, then a new era of authentic peace and progress can be introduced. Much of our energies will then go towards realizing the noble objectives to which the United Nations is dedicated. What better way for the United Nations to celebrate its fortieth anniversary than to succeed in achieving what has for too long eluded us, namely, a just, durable and comprehensive peace in the Middle East and the realization of the national and human rights of the Palestinian people.

194. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The voting on the draft resolutions on this agenda item will take place at a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[2] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15403.

[3] *Ibid., Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[4] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[5] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[6] *United States Code: Congressional and Administrative News*, 98th Congress—First Session, 1983, Public Law 98-151 (St. Paul, Minn., West Publishing Co., 1984).

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

77th
PLENARY MEETING
Wednesday, 28 November 1984, at 3.25 p.m.
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

2. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset of my statement yesterday [*75th meeting*], I referred to the fact that the international community calls on us to set our sights on a future untainted by the fanaticism and hegemonic ideas of the past and cease to enumerate past events from the United Nations rostrum so that we can profit from every possible opportunity to advance towards peace. We deeply regret the statement made by the representative of Israel two days ago [*72nd meeting*] and the way in which he attacked the Arabs. I am speaking in Arabic, our language, the language of Arab values and civilization, the true Arab heritage. We are proud of this heritage.

3. The representative of Israel chose to attempt to attribute the problem of the Middle East to the Arab character, as though that problem, of which the question of Palestine is the core, were caused by differences between Arabs or the intolerance of Arabs against non-Arab minorities in their countries.

4. Today, therefore, I wish to reject totally the attack on Egypt's present, past or future and any attempt to interfere in Egypt's internal affairs, directly or indirectly. We believe that the adoption of such a method is an attack on Egypt, which has chosen peace as a strategic goal, and we hope that the message on which Egypt based its statement of 27 November represents a movement towards the future so as not to miss other opportunities to achieve peace, stability and a settlement in which all the parties concerned can participate.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Observer of the League of Arab States has asked to make a statement in reply. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950.

6. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): The General Assembly has been exposed to a harangue against the Arab so-called political culture, as if a campaign of defamation had been let loose, and to gloating over the Arab problem. The Israeli representative has sought to distort our situation, our position and our objectives.

7. Does the nature of our Governments, our régimes, whatever value judgement one might make on them, constitute a reason or a licence for Israel to continue its annexation? Does the negative image, assuming that the distortions are valid, constitute absolution for Israel, allowing it to go on the loose, conquering and annexing? Is it on a so-called civilizing mission? Does Israel's occupation of our land help to improve our condition? Are we, according to the logic of the Israeli representative, improvable, or is our condition incorrigible? If so, do we deserve to survive, or are we expendable? Is this Zionist outlook towards the Arabs and towards our so-called political culture acceptable?

8. In the Arab world we may have problems; what society does not? For us, the problems of growth, of emerging societies, of our previous colonial periods, of modernism and traditional societies, of frustrated aspirations seeking an outlet, are indeed problems, but the thrust of Arab evolution is to affirm the pre-eminence of pluralism, equality for all, the centrality of the human person irrespective of race, colour, religion or religious affiliation.

9. That is in contrast to Israel, where discrimination is not a problem but a policy. It is institutionalized, it is legitimized, it is practised, it is preached, where to be a non-Jew means to be separate, to be different, to be alienated. It means to be another kind of citizen, preferably absent, even more preferably non-existent. Discrimination in Israel is the raison d'être of zionism, the raison d'être of Israel. Discrimination is built into the very fabric of this colonial settler entity.

10. Israel mutters these insults about Arab culture, resorting to heaping insults on us, on our culture, on our past and on our present. It reflects a well-established Israeli design—that is, to pre-empt our Arab future. What we are observing is a racist ideological monstrosity on the loose. It has to be checked, it has to be confronted, because it is dangerous, besides being profane.

11. Articulating, as the Israeli representative did, innuendos, half-truths, hearsay and rumours demonstrates an intention to substitute defamation of the Arab people and culture for an answer to the universal condemnation of Israel's occupation of Arab territories and its systematic denial of Palestinian rights. The onslaught by the Israeli representative on Arab culture, the Arab situation and the Arab nation was a pathetic attempt to deflect this Assembly from focusing on the root causes and germane issues. That is why Israel resorted to a filibuster.

12. What is more ominous, however, is the clear racist and indiscriminate association of the term "Arab" with terrorism, violence, plague: words that are charged with and intended to reinforce prejudice against the Arabs, deliberately to distort our image,

as well as our policies, our aspirations and our objectives. This tirade of intellectual and diplomatic terrorism is intended to keep the General Assembly off balance, sustain confusion on the issues and deflect the Assembly from the real, central issues.

13. He describes the Arab conflicts with Israel as "deeply rooted in this general intolerance" and says that "the Jews . . . are the only non-Arab people to have successfully defied Arab domination and achieved independence" [*72nd meeting, para. 106*]. Independence from whom? From whom did Israel achieve independence? Was there Arab domination? There was an Arab presence, with all Arab States fighting for their independence in the same manner as all third-world countries fight to remove colonial domination.

14. In this situation we do not want to dwell on the past; we have been attempting to focus on planning for a future of peace and justice which would enable a comprehensive peace to be durable. Despite the attempt to state that we are addicted to violence, we in the Arab world have always considered, do consider and will continue to consider Judaism as part of our spiritual heritage, as an ingredient in our civilization. We reject the idea that Israel or zionism can claim to rupture this Jewish humanist heritage in order to subvert it to Zionist revisionism, and that is why our challenge to Israel is not just a matter of territory but a conflict between two attitudes of life. That is why we resent—and we wanted to register our resentment—this tirade of defamation of an entire people, which is characteristic only of people with a racist ideology and is intended to humiliate us, because they want to establish Israeli hegemony over the entire Middle East.

15. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I should like to play for a moment textual critic and examine carefully a remark made by the Kuwaiti representative during the course of this debate. He told us that "Israel was an alien body in the unified body of the General Assembly" and that "There was no doubt that the international community rejected the alien body, as did the Arab world."

16. This comment, I suggest, should be pondered. The description he chose identified my country as an alien body. "Alien body" is one of the terms, one of the metaphors, used by the Government-controlled press in Kuwait, in Iraq, in Libya, in Syria and in many other Arab countries to describe Israel, but it is not the only one. A complementary term is "cancer". Israel is a "cancerous growth" within the Arab world.

17. Now, we all know what you have to do with an "alien body" or with "cancer": you have to excise it—not part of it, all of it. Indeed, Arab propaganda repeats this metaphor with great, I would say almost sickening, frequency. It is important that well-meaning people beyond the Middle East who are not exposed daily to radical Arab press invective and who do not listen to Arab media understand this fully. It was actually repeated helpfully by many Arab representatives here today who spoke of Israel as a "foreign element" and said that there cannot be peace in the Middle East until this element is eliminated.

18. I must say that in a show of enviable solidarity, the Iranian representative elaborated on this theme. He echoed some of his new-found colleagues by suggesting a solution—to use his precise words a "final solution". The "final solution" was the term used by the Nazis to describe the eradication of the Jewish people. And lest anyone here has doubts that we did not hear right, the Iranian representative went on to explain that the Zionist centre "must be eradicated".

19. On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the drafting of its Charter and 40 years after the holocaust, the Iranian representative proposes the eradication of a Member State as a "final solution", and no one in this Hall bats an eyelash.

20. Now some representatives who spoke today reluctantly admitted that there were other conflicts in the area, other than the Arab-Israeli one. I believe that the Iran-Iraq war, the bloodiest war since Viet Nam, was even mentioned, in a faint whisper, in one or two statements—although not, I believe, by an Arab representative. But here we do owe a debt to the representative of South Yemen. He explained that, well, maybe the Arab countries have occasional quarrels between them—this, by the way, from the representative of a country on whose soil there raged an inter-Arab war that claimed the lives of some 230,000 Arabs, which cleaved in two as a result of that horrible civil conflict, which today fights its northern Yemenite twin, which promotes terrorist squads throughout the Middle East, which suffered from Saudi incursions.

21. The Yemenite representative said that, if there were such quarrels, this was all in the family; they were all within the Arab household and should not be subjected to the scrutiny of the world.

22. I am not so sure that we can deal with the subject of today's debate, the Middle East situation, without examining these quarrels as well. And I am not so sure that 500,000 black Sudanese who perished in the Sudan would agree that all of this should not be examined. I am not so sure that tens of thousands of Kurds, killed by the Iraqi army, would agree that all of this should not be examined. Perhaps these people too are "foreign elements", "alien bodies".

23. The notion that all the insensate violence in the vast swath of land from the Sahara to the Gulf is to be off limits for discussion while the Arab-Israeli dispute, but one instance of a general pattern of intolerance to minorities, should be presented as the sole cause of this larger pattern—when indeed it is its result—does not only appear ludicrous, it is ludicrous. No amount of rhetoric or invective can hide the truth of the various conflicts that beset the region and that are open for all the world to see.

24. If we are to have peace in the Middle East, if we are to have the beginnings of a reconciliation, of a sober and realistic approach to the building of peace, we must look at the entire picture.

25. The PRESIDENT: I call again on the representative of the League of Arab States.

26. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): I am afraid that we are being exposed to a transformation in the subsequent reply and earlier in the statement of the Israeli representative, the Arab-Israeli conflict is being transformed into a problem of a minority State, or a minority, in the Middle East. I think that the attempt to deflect the attention of the General Assembly from the real issue of the Israeli-Arab conflict into an issue whereby it is inherent in the Arab character, Arab political culture, that Arabs

cannot tolerate so-called minorities, is a complete reversal of roles.

27. First of all, our conflict with Israel is not an Arab-Jewish conflict. We consider that there are many Arabs who are of Jewish faith; so in that respect we cannot consider that we are against part of the Arab world. Israel is predicated on the exclusivist Zionist thesis of a Jewish State, which by definition is exclusionary. Therefore, this is a State which excludes the original population from the exercise of their right to self-determination. It then pursues its objective by proliferating settlements to deny the Palestinian people even the right of self-determination in part of their homeland.

28. Our position is clear. In the decisions adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[1] and by our acceptance of the international peace conference, we have accepted the legitimacy, as has been described by United Nations resolutions, and therefore any attempt to throw the issue into issues irrelevant to this debate means that Israel is trying to buy time in order to annex more territories, distort more issues and expand further its military, political and ideological hegemony.

29. We are not in a conflict which is Arab and Jew. Therefore, we are a pluralistic nation. We have problems, as I said. In many instances we discriminate, but discrimination is, as in many other parts of the world, a problem and an embarrassment, while to Israel it is a policy and a matter of Zionist self-realization.

30. Therefore, any attempt to deflect the debate from its original purpose, namely, the right to self-determination and Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, is an attempt to inject new issues which are not germane to the debate and a deliberate attempt to filibuster in the General Assembly.

31. The PRESIDENT: The Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has requested to make a statement in reply. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974.

32. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): In our statement this morning [*76th meeting*], we were keen on the sole and the major aspect of this debate: how to find a comprehensive solution. We did say that we concurred fully with the findings and the conclusion of the Secretary-General that a comprehensive solution was the only way out. We never entertained any idea that somebody here would go into ideology and speak about final solutions.

33. But may I here remind the Assembly that the representative of the Zionist entity who sits here belongs to a Government the precursor of which, the Irgun Tzeva'i Leumi, was actively and militantly agitating in the 1930s and calling for co-operation with Hitler against the English. It is a shame that such people should find room here.

34. Be that as it may, we can never forget that the Zionist doctrine is based on what Herzl described as the "spiriting across" of the indigenous population; on what Jabotinsky, one of the revisionist leaders, said: that the prerequisite for the achievement of the Zionist dream is to use the iron fist and get the indigenous population out; and on what Koenig said as recently as 1976: that the endeavour should be to "thin out" the non-Jewish population in Galilee. The expression "thinning out" a population was first used by Eichmann when he referred to "thinning out" the Jews in Vienna.

35. Again, there is no difference in ideology. The Zionist and the Nazi ideologies are the same. Raanan Weiss, who was in charge of the Zionist colonization department, said that there was no room for the two peoples to live together, and their Chief of Staff, a certain Etan, said that the Arabs were like cockroaches dropped in a bottle. Very recently we have heard statements by members of the Knesset—which some people consider one of the most democratic institutions in the Middle East—really calling for a "final solution" and the elimination of non-Jewish citizens or elements from the State of Israel as well as from the occupied territories.

36. I just wished to remind this Assembly of what that gentleman who represents the Zionist entity belongs to.

37. The PRESIDENT: The voting on the draft resolutions submitted under this agenda item will take place at a subsequent meeting of the Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 15

Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs (*continued*):*

(*a*) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council

38. The PRESIDENT: As representatives will recall, at its 33rd meeting, on 22 October, the General Assembly elected four non-permanent members of the Security Council for a two-year period beginning on 1 January 1985. One seat therefore remains to be filled in the Council from an African or Asian State.

39. In accordance with established practice, there is an understanding to the effect that of the two States to be elected from Africa and Asia, one should be from Africa and one from Asia. Thailand was elected at the 33rd meeting; therefore, the remaining seat is to be filled from among the African States.

40. As the third restricted ballot, held at the 33rd meeting, was inconclusive, we must now, in accordance with the rules of procedure proceed to a first series of unrestricted ballots. In unrestricted balloting, any Member State from among the African States may be a candidate, except for Zimbabwe, which is an outgoing member and not eligible for immediate re-election, and for Burkina Faso and Egypt, which remain members of the Council in 1985.

41. Ballot papers are now being distributed. I request representatives to write the name of one State only. Ballot papers bearing more than one name will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Boukrif (Algeria), Mr. Halinen (Finland), Miss Rovirosa-Priego (Mexico), Mr. Fernandez (Philippines) and Mr. Rydzkowski (Poland) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.10 p.m.

42. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

---

*Resumed from the 34th meeting.

Number of ballot papers:	152
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	152
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	151
Required majority:	101
Number of votes obtained:	
Ethiopia	81
Somalia	68
United Republic of Tanzania	2

43. The PRESIDENT: Since none of those three States obtained the required two-thirds majority, the Assembly will now proceed to a second unrestricted ballot. As in the last ballot, I ask representatives to write the name of one State from among the African States, other than that of Burkina Faso, Egypt or Zimbabwe. Any ballot papers bearing more than one name will be declared invalid. The ballot papers are now being distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Boukrif (Algeria), Mr. Halinen (Finland), Miss Rovirosa-Priego (Mexico), Mr. Fernandez (Philippines) and Mr. Rydzkowski (Poland) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 4.20 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

44. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	149
Invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	148
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	147
Required majority:	98
Number of votes obtained:	
Ethiopia	77
Somalia	66
Kenya	2
United Republic of Tanzania	2

45. The PRESIDENT: Since the required two-thirds majority has not been obtained by any State, the Assembly will continue the voting and will hold a third unrestricted ballot. As in the last ballot, I would request members to write on each ballot the name of one State from among the African States other than Burkina Faso, Egypt and Zimbabwe. Any ballot papers containing more than one name will be declared invalid.

46. I call on the representative of Kenya on a point of order in connection with the voting.

47. Mr. KIILU (Kenya): I should like to thank those delegations that voted for Kenya in the last ballot. At the same time, I wish to inform the Assembly that Kenya is not a candidate.

48. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania on a point of order.

49. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): I wish to state that the United Republic of Tanzania abides by the decision of the Group of African States to support Ethiopia's candidature and that Tanzania is not a candidate.

50. The PRESIDENT: Representatives will bear those two statements in mind as they complete the ballot papers. Ballot papers are now being distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Boukrif (Algeria), Mr. Halinen (Finland), Miss Rovirosa-Priego (Mexico), Mr. Fernandez (Philippines) and Mr. Rydzkowski (Poland) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.

51. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	150
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	150
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	149
Required majority:	100
Number of votes obtained:	
Ethiopia	76
Somalia	67
United Republic of Tanzania	3
Kenya	2
Cameroon	1

52. The PRESIDENT: Because the result of the third unrestricted ballot was inconclusive, we must, in accordance with the rules of procedure, proceed to a first restricted ballot in the second series of restricted ballots. Since one seat remains to be filled from among the African States, the ballot will be restricted to the two States which obtained the largest number of votes in the last ballot, namely, Ethiopia and Somalia. This is consistent with rule 94 of the rules of procedure.

53. Ballot papers will now be distributed. I would request representatives to write the name of the one State for which they wish to vote. Ballot papers containing more than one name will be declared invalid.

54. I call on the representative of Cameroon on a point of order.

55. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): In stating that my delegation is not a candidate, we should also point out that it cannot be really serious for anyone to include the name of Cameroon, because this seat belongs to a State from East Africa, whereas Cameroon is in Central Africa. We take this opportunity to appeal to all representatives to focus on the two States that are known to be candidates and, in addition, on the opinion of the African States, and to listen to the appeal that has been made by the President with regard to the traditions of the United Nations system, since otherwise the consequences might be disruptive.

56. The PRESIDENT: I again remind representatives that this ballot is restricted to the two States which obtained the largest number of votes in the last ballot, namely, Ethiopia and Somalia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Boukrif (Algeria), Mr. Halinen (Finland), Miss Rovirosa-Priego (Mexico), Mr. Fernandez (Philippines) and Mr. Rydzkowski (Poland) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 4.55 p.m. and resumed at 5.00 p.m.

57. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	151
Invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	150
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	149
Required majority:	100

Number of votes obtained:	
Ethiopia	79
Somalia	70

58. The PRESIDENT: As neither candidate obtained the required two-thirds majority, the Assembly will continue the voting and will hold a second restricted ballot. As before, the only States whose names may be included on the ballot papers are Ethiopia and Somalia. Any papers containing the names of other States or the names of more than one State will be declared invalid. The ballot papers are now being distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Boukrif (Algeria), Mr. Halinen (Finland), Miss Rovirosa-Priego (Mexico), Mr. Fernandez (Philippines) and Mr. Rydzkowski (Poland) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 5.10 p.m. and resumed at 5.20 p.m.

59. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	152
Invalid ballots:	2
Number of valid ballots:	150
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	150
Required majority:	100
Number of votes obtained:	
Ethiopia	78
Somalia	72

60. The PRESIDENT: Since neither of the States has obtained the required two-thirds majority, the Assembly will continue the voting and will hold a third restricted ballot. As in the last ballot the only States whose names may be included in the ballot papers are Ethiopia and Somalia. Any papers containing the names of other States or the names of more than one State will be declared invalid. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Boukrif (Algeria), Mr. Halinen (Finland), Miss Rovirosa-Priego (Mexico), Mr. Fernandez (Philippines) and Mr. Rydzkowski (Poland) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 5.25 p.m. and resumed at 5.40 p.m.

61. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	152
Invalid ballots:	2
Number of valid ballots:	150
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	150
Required majority:	100
Number of votes obtained:	
Ethiopia	75
Somalia	75

62. The PRESIDENT: As neither of the two candidates obtained the required two-thirds majority, in accordance with the rules of procedure the Assembly will continue the voting and hold a series of three unrestricted ballots. However, I propose that we postpone the balloting to a later meeting to be announced in due course and suspend the election for the time being.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

78th
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 29 November 1984,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I propose that the list of speakers be closed this afternoon at 5 p.m. May I take it that there is no objection to this proposal?

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Kirca, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, who wishes to introduce the report of the Council [*A/39/24*].

3. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey), Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: It is my proud privilege and great honour first to congratulate the President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, on his assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly. I am doing so in my capacity of Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which he is the President. The Council he served with such distinction has made considerable progress in the discharge of its responsibilities under his skilful and dedicated leadership.

4. Our deep appreciation is also extended to the Secretary-General, who has demonstrated exemplary leadership qualities as Chief Executive of the United Nations in ensuring that the mandate of the Organization concerning the independence of Namibia is carried out with the highest degree of efficiency and dispatch.

5. Permit me to recall the President's statement to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session. On that occasion, Mr. Lusaka said, among other things:

> "The United Nations Council for Namibia remains convinced that the heroic and exemplary struggle of the people of Namibia for independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, aided by the sustained support of the international community, will soon bear the fruits of victory." [*101st meeting, para. 126.*]

6. Two whole years have gone by and those robust principles, that ardent hope expressed in the President's statement, still remain unimplemented, owing to South Africa's continued contravention of all the resolutions of the United Nations demanding a cessation of its illegal activities in Namibia. Indeed, the current session of the General Assembly marks the thirty-ninth year that the question of Namibia has been on the international agenda. During those years, fundamental decisions have been taken by both the Security Council and the General Assembly upholding the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. Attention has been drawn to the threat to international peace and security implicit in the continued illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia, but those decisions have remained unimplemented.

7. In spite of those resolutions, there has been an acceleration by South Africa and its trading partners of the ruthless plunder of Namibia's natural resources. Such plunder is ultimately bound to have an adverse effect on the economic development of an independent Namibia. Also, a concerted subversion of the national and territorial integrity and unity of Namibia by the racist South African régime has been the order of the day in that régime's claim to sovereignty over Walvis Bay and several islands that justly form an integral part of the Namibian territory.

8. South Africa has engaged in a bantustanization of the Namibian territory through uprooting indigenous Namibians from their homes and forcing them to live in the most unproductive sections of the Territory. The odious policies of *apartheid* have grown by leaps and bounds. There have been repeated attempts by the Pretoria régime to eliminate the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, through an escalation of its military operations and an intensification of its policies of aggression against the people of that Territory. Wanton killings, arrests and detentions without trial have been readily resorted to by South Africa in an attempt to foil the just aspirations of the Namibian people and other freedom fighters struggling for their inherent right to self-determination and independence. In fact, it was in January of this year that the Security Council had to convene another meeting to consider the question of the death sentence passed by the Supreme Court of South Africa on Benjamin Maloise Malesela, a member of the African National Congress of South Africa [*ANC*].

9. In June of this year, the South African régime arrested 37 SWAPO members and supporters, including several prominent personalities, who were gathered at a Catholic seminary at Dobra, eight miles north of Windhoek, to celebrate the release of 54

prisoners from the Mariental jail in May. These 54 prisoners were themselves incarcerated by South Africa six years earlier during its raids on the Kassinga refugee camp in 1978.

10. There have been reports that as recently as August 1984 widespread atrocities were again committed against civilians in the northern part of Namibia by the activities of the so-called special unit of the South African Defence Force who, posing as SWAPO freedom fighters, razed a kraal in western Kavango, killing several civilians, including women and children. These crimes against the people of Namibia are appalling to all freedom-loving and civilized nations.

11. States neighbouring South Africa have likewise been subjected to the régime's ruthless armed aggression. During the course of this year, the Security Council convened yet another meeting, in response to a request by Angola, in order to avert the worsening of the military situation in southern Angola and the violent combat being waged between South African military units and Angolan units about 200 kilometres from the Namibian border.

12. Since the collapse of the pre-implementation talks in Geneva in 1981—a collapse brought about by South Africa's intransigence—there have been continued and repeated attempts by that régime to impose an internal settlement in Namibia, outside the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That régime's preoccupation with linking Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola is justifiably regarded by the United Nations Council for Namibia as yet another attempt by the Pretoria régime to perpetuate its illegal administration in that Territory.

13. There have been endless speculations in the press about the recent discussions between South Africa and Angola on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Reports abound of other diplomatic efforts that are being made aimed at breaking out of the current impasse in the Namibian independence talks. While the United Nations Council for Namibia welcomes those discussions and efforts, it remains firmly convinced that the only fair and just settlement of the Namibian question will be one that falls within the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

14. The United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, has spared no effort to fulfil the responsibilities entrusted to it by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V). The totality of our concern for Namibia has been manifested in the various symposia and seminars that we have hosted during the course of the year. The objective of these exercises is to build public awareness of the Namibian cause and to draw the attention of the international community to the dangers inherent in South Africa's continued illegal occupation of that Territory.

15. In carrying out its various activities and programmes, the Council has been much encouraged by the firm solidarity and support of Member States. Those States and some of their domestic organizations have expressed a genuine desire for an effective solution of the Namibian question. A common conclusion that can be drawn from the various symposia and seminars organized by the Council during the course of this year is the recognition, by the participants, of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, unqualified support for the Council's various activities and an appeal to the Council to accelerate its efforts to achieve independence for the people of Namibia.

16. In the Bangkok Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [*A/39/24, part two, chap. III, sect. B*], adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 25 May 1984 at its extraordinary plenary meetings held at Bangkok, the Council emphasized the importance of action by local authorities, trade unions, religious bodies, academic institutions, mass media, solidarity movements and other non-governmental organizations, as well as individual men and women, in mobilizing Governments and public opinion in support of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, and in counteracting all forms of collaboration with the occupation régime in Namibia. It commended all those who had steadfastly supported the Namibian cause for their unflagging commitment and urged them further to co-ordinate and intensify their efforts.

17. I wish to reiterate the profound gratitude of the United Nations Council for Namibia to all the participants in our various gatherings and to express the hope that they will use their influence with the Governments of their respective countries in furtherance of the achievement of the aims and objectives of the Council. The Council is fully convinced that it was such influence that led to the exertion of the international pressure which secured the release of Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo on 1 March 1984, after 16 years of incarceration by the racist régime of South Africa.

18. Against that background, I am sure that the Assembly will understand why it is the fervent hope of the Council that it may once again rely on the Assembly for overwhelming support for and favourable reaction to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24*], which I am about to present to it.

19. This report consists of four parts and three annexes. The first part deals with the work of the Council as a policy-making organ of the United Nations; the second part concerns the work of the Council as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia; the third part concerns the organization and decisions of the Council; and the fourth part deals with recommendations and activities involving financial implications. It is the fourth part that contains the draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia to the General Assembly for adoption.

20. As in recent years, the Council is again presenting five draft resolutions to the General Assembly.

21. In draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa", account is taken of previous resolutions recommended to and adopted by the General Assembly on the question of Namibia. In this text, South Africa's continued colonial domination of the Territory is firmly denounced and concerted efforts are called for to counter all manoeuvres aimed at undermining the fulfilment of the primary responsibility of the United Nations for the decolonization of Namibia.

22. For the past several years, the Security Council has been called upon by the United Nations Council for Namibia to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to ensure

the total cessation of all co-operation with that régime by Governments, corporations, institutions and individuals. That appeal is reiterated in draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

23. The "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia" is the subject of draft resolution C. Draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia", envisages a broad programme of activities aimed at intensifying the international campaign in support of the Namibian cause. In draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia", the Assembly decides that the Council should continue to formulate policies of assistance to Namibians and coordinate assistance for Namibia provided by the specialized agencies and other organizations and institutions of the United Nations system. The Assembly expresses its appreciation of the assistance from those bodies and urges their close co-operation with the United Nations Institute for Namibia in strengthening the programme of its activities.

24. In general, the draft resolutions appeal, as have those of previous years, to the international community for its unreserved support for the just struggle of the Namibian people and all measures undertaken by the Council in the promotion of independence for Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Our draft resolutions may have been couched in milder tones during the initial stages of our negotiations with the racist régime for a withdrawal of its illegal occupation from Namibia. The firmness of our draft resolutions in recent years is our natural reaction to South Africa's ongoing rejection of all efforts on the part of the United Nations to solve the Namibian question. Also, the intensity of our appeals is consistent with the diversification of our work and our increased commitment and obligations concerning the liberation of the Namibian people.

25. I express the hope that the initiatives taken by the Council in each of these draft resolutions will generate a favourable reaction.

26. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Adhami, who will introduce chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee [*A/39/23*].

27. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee, covering its work during 1984 concerning the question of Namibia.

28. The report is submitted pursuant to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 38/54, of 7 December 1983, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, by which the General Assembly requested the Special Committee

> "to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories that have not yet attained independence and, in particular:
>
> "(*a*) To formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism . . . ".

29. In continuing to perform these tasks in relation to the question of Namibia, the Special Committee took into consideration the various relevant resolutions of the General Assembly concerning this question, in particular resolutions 38/36 A to E, as well as the related decisions of the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

30. As will be noted from the report, in 1984 the Special Committee once again examined in depth the developments relating to the question of Namibia, with the active participation of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the representative of SWAPO.

31. In a decision adopted by the Special Committee, as reflected in paragraph 15 of chapter IX of the report, the Committee noted with great concern the critical situation in and around Namibia resulting from the continued illegal occupation of the Territory by the racist minority régime of South Africa, its persistent defiance of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and its sinister attempts to impose neo-colonial institutions on the people of Namibia, through bogus and puppet political groupings, to legitimize an internal settlement. The *apartheid* régime of South Africa is thus responsible for a situation that seriously threatens international peace and security.

32. Because of the intransigence of South Africa, its persistent delaying tactics to prevent the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), its massive military buildup in Namibia and its repeated acts of armed aggression against the Namibian people, the Special Committee observed that it was more imperative than ever for the United Nations to reassert its legal responsibility for Namibia and take urgent steps to bring about faithful and unqualified compliance by the racist régime of South Africa with the decisions of the United Nations in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise without further delay their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

33. In reaffirming once again that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, the Special Committee condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of the Territory, its brutal repression of the Namibian people and its persistent violation of their human rights, as well as its efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

34. The Special Committee reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia and the legitimacy of their struggle, by all means at their disposal, against the illegal occupation of their territory.

35. The Special Committee rejected and denounced all manoeuvres by South Africa designed to bring about a sham independence in Namibia under a puppet régime or any other fraudulent constitutional and political schemes designed to perpetuate its colonial domination in Namibia. It condemned the latest attempts by South Africa to circumvent the United Nations plan by promoting an internal settlement through the so-called Multi-Party Conference. Such attempts by the racist régime, following on the heels of the decision to establish a so-called State Council with the object of drawing up a "Constitu-

tion", once again made it clear that the Pretoria régime had no intention of complying with the letter and the spirit of the United Nations plan and sought instead to consolidate its illegal hold on the Territory through the installation of puppet political institutions subservient to its own interests. Declaring that all illegal acts taken to this end were null and void, the Special Committee called upon all States to deny any recognition to and to refuse all collaboration with any illegal entity that South Africa might impose upon the Namibian people in disregard of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

36. Condemning South Africa for its large-scale military buildup in Namibia, its introduction of compulsory military service for Namibians, its forced recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies, its use of mercenaries to reinforce its illegal occupation of the Territory and to participate in its attacks against independent African States, and its illegal use of Namibian territory for acts of aggression against independent African countries and the establishment of new military bases, the Special Committee called upon all States to take effective measures to prevent the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries for service in Namibia. It further condemned the continued military, economic and intelligence collaboration between South Africa and certain Western and other States, in particular the United States and Israel. The Committee accordingly called for all such collaboration to be terminated forthwith. The Committee condemned and rejected the policy of so-called constructive engagement pursued by the United States Government, which had further emboldened the *apartheid* régime to intensify its repression of the people of South Africa and Namibia and to escalate aggression against the front-line States. That policy had also encouraged the régime to continue its intransigence over the independence of Namibia, against the wishes and aspirations of the Namibian people and in defiance of resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. It recommended that the Security Council consider adopting further measures to widen the scope of resolution 418 (1977) in order to make it more effective and comprehensive.

37. Reiterating that the United Nations plan for Namibia, endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), remained the only acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, the Special Committee reaffirmed the need to proceed to its immediate implementation without modification, qualification or pre-condition and reaffirmed the need to hold, without further delay, free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in the whole of Namibia as one political entity, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

38. The Special Committee rejected the attempts by South Africa and its allies to impart to the question of Namibia a dimension different from what it is, namely, an act of colonial domination in violation of the principles and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. The question of Namibia has always been and remains a decolonization issue and should be addressed and resolved in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] and other relevant United Nations resolutions.

39. Any attempt, therefore, to portray the Namibian question as part of an East-West confrontation or to link it with other extraneous considerations was a flagrant defiance of the will of the international community, as reflected in the position adopted by the United Nations, and could only have the effect of further delaying the independence of Namibia. In rejecting the persistent attempts by the United States and South Africa to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous and irrelevant issues, in particular the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, the Special Committee recalled that both the General Assembly and the Security Council had rejected such linkage and emphasized unequivocally that the persistence of such attempts would only retard the decolonization process in Namibia as well as constitute interference in the internal affairs of Angola. The Committee called upon those who drew this linkage to abandon immediately the policy, which was unacceptable and repugnant to the international community.

40. Further, the Special Committee condemned the South African and other foreign economic interests which continued to exploit and plunder the human and natural resources of the Territory, in disregard of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] and demanded that such exploitation cease forthwith. In reaffirming that all the natural resources of Namibia were the inviolable and incontestable heritage of the Namibian people, the Committee condemned South Africa's illegal exploitation of such resources, including its illegal extension of the territorial sea, its proclamation of an economic zone off the coast of Namibia and its illegal exploitation of the Territory's marine resources.

41. Finally, the Special Committee recommended that the Security Council act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, and it recommended that the Security Council, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa's actions, respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that country under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

42. On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend its report to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

43. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Koroma.

44. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone), Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: I am gratified to see Mr. Lusaka, an eminent and worthy representative of Zambia, presiding over this session of the General Assembly. His election is a deserved tribute to his country, whose Government and people are in the front line of the struggle for equality, freedom and justice, as well as against the outrageous and outmoded system of *apartheid*. The sacrifice of the people of Zambia in promoting and supporting that struggle is a source of inspiration to us all. His presidency is also an eloquent testimony to

his own excellent qualities as a diplomat, statesman and dedicated fighter for freedom and justice.

45. May I say how equally gratified I am at seeing Mr. Gbeho presiding over the deliberations of this important question. Having worked closely with him as a friend and colleague here in New York and having experienced his qualities of leadership, eminently displayed as they have been, I am convinced that these deliberations could not have been under a better stewardship.

46. As the Assembly turns its attention to the question of Namibia, this most intransigent of problems, it is profoundly disquieting that the efforts of the international community to bring about genuine independence in Namibia continue to be obstructed by the defiant attitude of the minority régime of South Africa. Almost 18 years after the General Assembly's historic decision [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] to declare Namibia an international Territory under its jurisdiction, South Africa is the one and only country that has refused to accept the legality of that decision despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice[2] confirming it.

47. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa constitutes a blatant violation of international law, the denial of self-determination to the Namibian people, the continued encroachment on and defiance of the authority of the United Nations and a veritable threat to international peace and security. All those elements have made this question a perennial item on the agenda of the United Nations for nearly 40 years now.

48. Furthermore, the minority régime continues to resort to force and political stratagems in order to prolong its illegal occupation of the Territory and to deny the oppressed people of Namibia their most basic rights and fundamental freedoms.

49. Constant delaying tactics amply demonstrate what we already know—that is, that South Africa will not willingly permit the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people for true independence and liberation. On the contrary, it has, with calculated cunning, exploited the efforts of the international community and seeks to bring about a sham independence in Namibia under a puppet régime designed to perpetuate its colonial domination in Namibia. We have all been witnesses to South Africa's dilatory manoeuvres and to the deceitful manner in which, while delaying the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it has presented us with a succession of *faits accomplis*, including the latest attempts to circumvent the United Nations plan by promoting an internal settlement through the so-called Multi-Party Conference.

50. Speaking on 28 November 1983, at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly [*72nd meeting*], I stated that the situation prevailing in Namibia, which continued to elude a peaceful transition to majority rule, was entirely due to the ongoing intransigence of the racist occupying régime of South Africa. At the same time, I underscored the obligation of the international community to apply all available measures to bring about South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the Security Council and to put an end to its illegal occupation of that international Territory.

51. One year later, despite the continuing efforts of the international community, the situation in Namibia continues to pose a threat to international peace and security. During the period, a series of intensified measures and actions were taken by the United Nations bodies and organs concerned in our continuing efforts to find an internationally acceptable solution to the problem. Conferences, seminars and symposia were held at the international, regional and national levels. As described just now so succinctly by the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, throughout the year the Council has given extensive consideration to every aspect of the question. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, within the context of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, also undertook a serious and vigorous review of the situation in Namibia and, in a decision adopted on 20 August 1984 [*A/39/23, chap. IX, sect. B*], firmly reiterated a set of fundamental principles and the underlying tenets for the liberation of the people of Namibia from 100 years of colonial oppression.

52. Inasmuch as the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, my colleague and friend Mr. Adhami, has just given a thorough outline of that decision, I shall not elaborate on it further; nor do I intend to give a detailed account of the decisions, declarations or conclusions adopted at those forums because they are all too well known to us here. I wish only to emphasize that the crisis situation in South Africa, *in toto*, owes its being to the inhuman and criminal schemes of subterfuge perpetrated by the illegal occupying régime of Pretoria to seek control over the region through acts of aggression, destabilization and political and economic domination. South Africa continues its blatant attempt to intimidate and demoralize its opponents outside its borders and to stifle and decimate those within South Africa and in Namibia.

53. Through an expansionist scheme which it calls a "constellation of States", South Africa continues its relentless attempt to seek and maintain economic and political subjugation of its neighbours and to exert its control over their policies and their development. These unceasing acts of military aggression and political and economic brigandage, both overt and covert, have inflicted severe economic damage on its neighbours, thus further aggravating the already explosive situation in the region.

54. In tandem with the illegal occupation of Namibia, the Pretoria chieftains have continued occupying southern Angola for the past three years and have refused to withdraw from that territory. It is against this background that the Special Committee has once again reiterated its calls for, first, immediate application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations; secondly, intensified assistance to the people of Namibia and their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO; and thirdly, provision of the maximum possible assistance to the member Governments of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference to help them in their efforts to promote regional economic co-operation and development and reduce their economic dependence on the Pretoria régime. On behalf of the Special Committee, I wish to reiterate the confident hope that these appeals will meet with positive responses from all Member States and from the United Nations system of organizations.

55. We, the members of the international community, have the means to solve the problem of the

illegal occupation of Namibia. All that is required of us is that we summon the will to address ourselves to the problem squarely and that we persevere in the only course open to us—that of support for the people whose future we have taken in our hands and whose cause we should betray if we hesitated further in bringing full and effective pressure to bear on the oppressors.

56. Before concluding, I should like, on behalf of the Special Committee, to acknowledge with appreciation the important work being carried out by the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it. The role of the Council as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence cannot be over-emphasized. At the present stage of the struggle of the Namibian people, it is essential that the Council be given the maximum co-operation by all the Member States so that it can continue to discharge its responsibilities with even greater effectiveness.

57. I am confident that, under the President's leadership and guidance and given his skill, wisdom and diplomacy, the work of the Assembly will make a further positive contribution towards ending the situation in Namibia. We of the Special Committee are convinced that the independence of Namibia is inevitable.

58. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cameroon, who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States.

59. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): The issue of Namibia has been before the General Assembly for nearly 40 years, drawing the cries of the afflicted peoples of Africa, provoking the indignation of peoples across the globe who still cling to the noble values of decency and demonstrating the scope of the threats and defiance that the decadent South African régime represents to the United Nations and the principles of its Charter, a defiance that mocks our collective endeavour to build a new world motivated by the imperative need to save succeeding generations everywhere from the scourge of war.

60. In these years, we have assembled mountains of speeches and declarations, pleading, appealing, threatening and arguing among ourselves, going to the International Court of Justice for determinations and declaratory judgements that were obvious, some appeasing the South African régime even when its actions are contrary to the most cherished legal traditions and moral values of their nations. Some have introduced ideologies and concepts in their attitudes towards that régime, which purport to carve out a way towards improving the situation in southern Africa. If these have done anything at all, they have succeeded in causing diversionary debates and buying more time and encouragement for the racist régime. What they definitely have not done is change the perspectives, the designs and the naked defiance of the settler group on the southernmost tip of our continent.

61. We have listened with deep appreciation to the statements of the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other speakers. Two nights ago we had the privilege of listening to Nobel Peace Prize winner Bishop Desmond Tutu, Secretary-General of the South African Council of Churches, and also of hearing the pertinent observations of United States Senator Edward Kennedy. All of these have underlined the gospel truth that, far from improving, the situation—a situation, in fact, mischievously created by the racist régime in southern Africa—has worsened. What was said in the debate on *apartheid* is equally applicable to the Namibia issue.

62. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity met at its twentieth ordinary session at Addis Ababa, from 12 to 15 November 1984. The African leaders reviewed the situation in Namibia, reaffirming not only "the primary responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia" but also that "Namibia's independence cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues which are patently damaging to the decolonization process of Namibia".[3]

63. Next year we shall commemorate the beginning of the last decade of the first half-century of the United Nations. We cannot afford to celebrate as we take stock of the failures that have haunted the attainments. The freedom of the Namibian people is not an academic question requiring speeches and ineffective resolutions. It involves the determination of a deprived people to survive. For the entire continent, the present situation makes nonsense of the principles of self-determination and threatens the entire region with an inevitable arms race, with grave repercussions not only for economic development but also for international peace and security.

64. It is time we mobilized our collective forces at the United Nations to bring a speedy end to the despicable conditions of illegal and immoral imperialism in Namibia. The organ responsible for security in the United Nations system is the Security Council. Six years have elapsed since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted; its implementation is in a state of paralysis which the Council and the General Assembly cannot ignore if our credibility before history is to be sustained.

65. South Africa has betrayed the generation that entrusted the colonial Territory of South West Africa to it, that gave that racist régime a mandate to hold it in trust under the stated ideals of the international community, which has progressively developed to assume its contemporary corpus. There has been a shameless and fraudulent conversion of the Territory, obtained under a specific mandate, to an annexation for illegal and immoral gratification.

66. Others, such as Great Britain and France, were given similar responsibilities in Africa, concerning my own country, Cameroon, for one. They fulfilled their mandates, adhering to the rules of civilized conduct and permitting history to take its course without bloodshed.

67. It is time for all members of the Security Council, in whose hands permanent responsibilities were placed because of their proved ability to maintain peace and security, to take the necessary action in accordance with their sense of their responsibility. Resolutions adopted here and in the Security Council at this time cannot be a substitute for the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and, especially, 435 (1978). The proliferation of resolutions is not the problem; the acts perpetrated by the occupation forces and the racist régime constitute the problem.

68. It is the apparent impotence of this universal body on this issue that inflates the arrogance and the illusions of the South African régime, an impotence which is demonstrated by the search for annual tranquillizers in the form of purely condemnatory resolutions and the exhibition of a sense of resignation in the face of a grave evil.

69. For the immediate victims of the curse on our generation represented by the Namibian case, the best and most appropriate resolution at this time is that which each nation makes to provide both the necessary political will and the material resources for the immediate ending of one of the most explosive situations of our times.

70. We must all remember that the spirit of people struggling for the survival of their fatherland can never be destroyed, not even by the development of nuclear weapons, which even the uncivilized racists would not dare to use within or outside their current jurisdiction.

71. We salute the heroic struggle of our brothers and sisters in Namibia, under the inspired leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. History is on our side; the continental African struggle will succeed, no matter how long it takes and no matter what the cost.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the Chair.

72. Wars are always hell, but those who die in that hell in the noble pursuit of freedom and justice do not die in vain. It is death for a fundamental freedom—to remain free, to be the architect of the determination of one's fortune.

73. In the larger context of the values set forth in and sustained by the Charter of the United Nations, the freedom fighter of today is the truest defender of that Charter and the great builder of lasting peace. We can make his labours easier by removing the necessity for armed struggle. His road looks dark and lonely today because of the indifference of some of the critical nations which have the power to cause change; but this is part of the price that history's great must pay. Victory in the long run is a substantial reward.

74. As for the lackadaisical régime in South Africa, which so obviously relishes dangerous political jokes, perhaps to soothe its wild instincts, we recommend that its members look at the clear writing on the walls of history. Resources spent on aggression could be better channelled to development and to peace. It is the persistence in mistakes that constitutes evil. Childlike and mischievous constitutional contrivances bring neither lasting comfort nor solutions. In the glory that is assumed to exist, through the illusions of support on the part of those who propose unworkable systems in their relations with the South African Government, the ingredients of doom are embodied.

75. Nations rise and fall as part of the process of history. That process is designed for the arrogant who reject change and who must lose the power they refuse to use with a sense of the values of justice and peace.

76. In closing, we once again appeal to the conscience of the leaders of the world and call on them to abandon the cause of appeasement in connection with the racist and decadent régime of South Africa and to join in working out a concrete programme for the dissolution of the cruel imperialism and the most evil form of racism that blocks the exercise by the Namibian people of their right to the benefits of freedom and peace.

77. We invite those that still entertain illusions regarding the devastation caused by the obstructionist policy of *apartheid* to listen to the reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to the details of experiences supplied by the legitimate leaders of the heroic people themselves, namely, SWAPO. It is not to the racist perpetrators that we turn for information and change within; it is, indeed, to the victims of the system, the men, women and children who carry out the resistance, to the families of murdered patriots and witnesses, that we must turn for an understanding of the hideous crimes against humanity perpetrated in Namibia.

78. We have noted with interest the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the President of the People's Republic of Angola, José Eduardo dos Santos [*A/39/688*], on efforts to bring about the withdrawal of troops from Angola. We sincerely hope that there will be a troop withdrawal, but the Namibian question must not be linked unduly with issues which touch upon the security of the sister country of Angola. The true issue is the independence and freedom of Namibia. We must not be distracted from that truth. Once free, Namibia could help the cause of lasting international peace in the area.

79. The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152 of 20 December 1976.

80. Mr. TOIVO ya TOIVO (South West Africa People's Organization): I feel very honoured and privileged to be addressing this thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. Until February of this year, it had never occurred to me that one day I might be addressing the United Nations. I know that over the years many of my colleagues in the leadership of SWAPO have been able to present the demands of the oppressed but struggling Namibian people, both from this rostrum and before other organs of the United Nations.

81. I consider this, however, a unique opportunity personally to bring to all Members warm greetings and best wishes from my people, whose heroic anti-colonial struggle marks its one-hundredth year in 1984, from their militant national liberation movement, SWAPO, and from the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia [*PLAN*]. As a people, my people regard themselves as the ward of the United Nations. It follows from this that, because they have so regarded themselves all these years, my people wish me to say to the Assembly that they are very tired of repeated promises and pious words, which have so far proved meaningless considering racist South Africa's continued defiance of the authority of the United Nations and the brutal aggression and State terrorism that are so prevalent today in our country.

82. What my people expect from the United Nations and the rest of the international community at this critical stage in their struggle is no more mere words, but concrete and meaningful action to implement the resolutions and decisions already adopted on the question of Namibia, particularly the adoption of enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to force the Pretoria régime to relinquish its illegal hold over Namibia.

83. While the world community is paying tribute to the 100 years of heroic struggle of our valiant people against colonial occupation and foreign exploitation, we should like to urge our friends and supporters to redouble their efforts to increase concrete material, financial, military and humanitarian assistance to our movement to enable us further to intensify the struggle to wrest our freedom from the racist occupiers of our country. Our patriotic struggle is legitimate

and just, and we therefore expect those who uphold justice and love peace to spare no efforts to assure a speedy end to colonialism, *apartheid* and reaction in our motherland.

84. I have spent the past 18 years in the racist gaols of the *apartheid* régime; I spent 16 of those precious years of my life on the notorious Robben Island. I am out of gaol today, and I am glad to be here, but sad that my country is not yet free. My compatriots and I were incarcerated in 1966 for opposing the colonial oppression and humiliation that our people go through daily at the hands of the *apartheid* racists in our country. We were political prisoners. The only crime we were guilty of was our relentless demand to be free and to see to it that our people would once again become masters of their own destiny.

85. During the period between 1966, when we were arrested, and 1968, when we appeared before the racist court, all of us came to terms with the hard realities of the situation we were in. We realized in due course that some of us were destined to die and that others would spend many years in gaol.

86. The all-white parliament in Cape Town—to which Botha and his henchmen are now trying to give a deceptive multi-racial appearance under the guise of the bogus constitutional reforms which stand rejected by the majority of the people of South Africa—rushed through, in 1967, yet another piece of Draconian legislation, which became known as the Terrorism Act, designed expressly to deal with the case of the captured SWAPO freedom fighters. This repressive law was adopted within a matter of days and was made retroactive to 1962, specifically in order to convict us.

87. The trial itself was a complete mockery. It was a severely harrowing experience for all of us. We witnessed an extreme example of racial intolerance. Indeed, all of us had been tortured in one way or another for months on end in the *apartheid* dungeons—our torture included being kept in solitary confinement for very long periods—to compel us to sign the so-called confessions admitting that we were guilty of the charges trumped up against our movement.

88. At the end of the kangaroo-court trial, the racist court convicted us, solely on the basis of statements extracted from us through torture and Nazi-style interrogations and the "evidence" of witnesses similarly tortured and intimidated, as well as on the basis of the lies told by some puppet chiefs and headmen who had been brainwashed to repeat malicious anti-SWAPO propaganda to suit the whims of their masters.

89. Before 34 of us were sentenced on 9 February 1968—22 of us to life imprisonment; 7 of us, myself included, to 20 years' hard labour; 2 of us to five years; and 3 of us to three-year suspended sentences—I made a statement from the dock. I am pleased to have learned since my release, from my SWAPO comrades and from numerous well-wishers, that the words I spoke in 1968 in Pretoria, in the name of SWAPO and on behalf of those accused with me, indeed, on behalf of the entire oppressed people of Namibia, have had some lasting impact worldwide and have helped to galvanize world public opinion in support of our cause and the ongoing campaign for the release of all South African and Namibian political prisoners.

90. On that fateful day in Pretoria, far from the land of our birth, it became very clear to me that our character as patriots and our commitment to the cause were being put to the test. Our accusers and torturers were anxious to see whether we would disown SWAPO, renounce the armed struggle and betray the trust and confidence placed in us by our people. Our inspiration came from the enduring anti-colonial heritage of national resistance that has come down to us through the years from our forefathers.

91. The awesome weight that descended upon us in the courtroom as we awaited our fate did not in any way shake the indomitable spirit of our people, which had sustained us throughout the ordeal up to that point. I was ever conscious of the courage and devotion with which the brave Namibian sons and daughters, the combatants of SWAPO's military wing, PLAN, set out to liberate the motherland. I also knew that, no matter how hard the Boers tried during the so-called trial to cut us off from our people and the world, those who uphold justice and love peace would continue to support the just struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, for freedom and national independence.

92. With all this in mind, I stated, in part:

> "We are Namibians and not South Africans. We do not now, and will not in the future, recognize your right to govern us, to make laws for us in which we had no say, to treat our country as if it were your property and us as if you were our masters. We have always regarded South Africa as an intruder in our country. This is how we have always felt and this is how we feel now, and it is on this basis that we have faced this trial."

93. Then I felt it was necessary for me to remind my accusers a little about what happened during the Second World War, in order to expose the pretence and hypocrisy. These were my words:

> "My Lord, you found it necessary to brand me as a coward. During the Second World War, when it became evident that both my country and your country were threatened by the dark clouds of nazism, I risked my life to defend both of them, wearing a uniform with orange bands on it. But some of your countrymen, when called to battle to defend civilization, resorted to sabotage against their own fatherland. I volunteered to face German bullets, and as a guard of military installations, both in South West Africa and the Republic, I was prepared to be the victim of their sabotage. Today they are our masters and are considered the heroes, and I am called the coward."

94. These are the Nazi collaborators and saboteurs whom Reagan, in 1981, soon after he became President, erroneously characterized as the wartime allies and friends of the United States and whom he refused to abandon.

95. I feel even more strongly now than at the time when we were incarcerated and I am proud that we had taken up arms to fight for the liberty of our people and the independence of the motherland.

96. At the end of my statement, I declared with conviction that I was a loyal Namibian and could not betray my people to their enemies. I dared to admit that I had decided to assist the combatants of SWAPO in the armed struggle which our movement had launched on 26 August 1966. Considering the increasing military buildup and the extensive use of the colonial army and police for political purposes, it became obvious to us that the struggle would be long and bitter. But my colleagues and I were convinced

that our people would wage that struggle, whatever the cost.

97. I believe firmly that the price of liberty is suffering—that is to say, a patriot who considers himself a man must be prepared to die for his people and country.

98. The account I have given here about what my compatriots and I suffered is by no means the whole story about the brutal, long and systematic massacres, violence and repression to which our people have been subjected by the successive colonial régimes during the past 100 years in Namibia. As leaders and as combatants, we are servants of the people. That is why I feel—and I know those of my fellow countrymen who were released with me, and others since, feel the same way—that our release, in spite of the years that we spent behind the iron bars of the racist gaols, is meaningless as long as our country is not yet free. We have merely rejoined the larger community of the suffering masses in a concentration camp, namely, the whole country, Namibia, occupied illegally by the racist régime of Pretoria which relies on a huge occupation army of more than 100,000 troops, police and other racist and puppet agents of colonialism and foreign interests to maintain domination.

99. When we were called upon to renew our pledge and loyalty to SWAPO—that ideal for which we had taken up arms to honour the commitment to the cause of the total liberation of our country—we were categorical and unwavering. I know that this is what our people and movement expected of us, and no less. We kept the faith and paid our dues.

100. I would like to take this opportunity to thank most sincerely the United Nations, its Secretaries-General, who have spearheaded the Organization during the past 18 years, and all those in various parts of the world whose dedication and hard work have resulted in our release, and to say to one and all that I consider our release a victory for international solidarity and the dynamic campaign for the release of all Namibian and South African political prisoners. May I urge you all to intensify this co-operation and campaign until all the political prisoners in the racist gaols in *apartheid* South Africa and occupied Namibia are released unconditionally. I should also stress once again that all captured freedom fighters should be accorded prisoner-of-war status.

101. Equally, I should further appeal to the international community to render humanitarian assistance to SWAPO in order to assist those who have just been released in terms of resettlement and rehabilitation.

102. Needless to say, the Namibian people believe in the ideals for which the United Nations stands. We uphold the principles of its Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Together they hold out a promise for a just world order, complete with liberation, justice and progress for all the oppressed and colonized peoples everywhere. Our participation in the work of the United Nations has given not only a further enhancement to our diplomatic standing but also legitimacy to the struggle, so that today we are able to see ever broadening and deepening support from all the continents of the world.

103. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that there are many impediments which are being put in the way of Namibia's independence by some of the States Members of the United Nations. The major Western Powers, which are more preoccupied with their own direct control of the world's raw materials and with the unimpeded reaping of profits, have consistently derailed the process of Namibia's independence. They have, in the process, thrown their prestige and resources behind the *apartheid* régime, to the extent that they are today without doubt witting collaborators in the bloody repression in South Africa itself and the perpetuation of illegal occupation and colonial oppression in Namibia. Theirs is a single-minded greed for mineral rights over human rights.

104. As long ago as 1958, and indeed before, I used to send petitions and correspondence to the United Nations.

105. Strange as it might sound now from the vantage point of the 1980s, at that time, in the 1950s, we were not demanding even the exercise of the right to self-determination, let alone calling for independence. We would have been satisfied with trusteeship status under the auspices of the United Nations. One thing was absolutely certain: we hated, as we still do today, the *apartheid* system. We wanted the Boers and their obnoxious *apartheid* system out of our country—lock, stock and barrel. There were no two ways about that.

106. I must confess, however, that our initial view of the United Nations and its ability to save us from the clutches of the racists was rather naïve and unrealistic. Apparently we had not fully understood the conflicting interests of the Member States, between those closely tied to *apartheid* South Africa and those which were supportive of the aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who were fighting for freedom and nationhood. Also, the balance of power and influence in the United Nations at that time, unlike today, favoured the West. South Africa was, therefore, insulated from ostracism and encouraged to entrench *apartheid* and colonialism at will.

107. In 1958 I sent a tape-recorded message to the United Nations, hidden between the leaves of Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island*. In that message, as in other communications, I urged the United Nations to show the courage of its conviction to bring racist South Africa to book for its total failure to promote to the utmost the material, moral and social well-being and political development of the Namibian people, leading them to independence in the spirit of the "sacred trust". That the "sacred trust" has been betrayed, not only by the racist occupiers of our country but also by some powerful Western countries that have, for selfish reasons, allied themselves with *apartheid*, is well known, regrettable as this situation is. Quite a number of my compatriots sent similar written petitions to the United Nations, since we were not allowed to travel abroad to publicize the plight of the Namibian people.

108. As I speak now, my people have their ears glued to their transistor radios in the hope that my words before the General Assembly will rekindle outrage and invigorate the world community to take concrete measures to assure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

109. So much has changed in the course of the past 18 years in the field of decolonization. In the late 1950s and the early 1960s, we were confident that Namibia would be free long before some of our neighbours in southern Africa, all of which are now independent States; but when independence finally comes, Namibia will be one of the two last colonial

strangleholds to be freed. On the other hand, all has not been lost. For their part, the Namibian patriots have sustained the long and bitter struggle against overwhelming odds and against the most powerful military machine of racist South Africa. The changes that have taken place in the world have augured well for the intensification of the struggle. In a no less significant way, the forces of liberation have contributed towards those positive changes.

110. I have discovered during my travels since my release, in Africa, Europe and the United States, and particularly on the basis of the invaluable contacts that I have made here at the United Nations, that there is much goodwill and support for our cause and solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the struggling Namibian people.

111. The United Nations, which has for so long featured in my dreams and served as a beacon of hope for the solution of world problems and for bringing about conditions that would enable our people to achieve self-government and national sovereignty, is no longer a remote place somewhere in the world. I have observed some of its workings for a while now. I have been listening to statements made in the General Assembly since the beginning of its thirty-ninth session. I now have mixed feelings about the Organization on the basis of various positions taken by different delegations on the burning issues of the day. I have witnessed how, in the interest of political expediency and naked greed, some countries continue, without shame, to try to explain away their long-standing collusion with colonialism and *apartheid* in order to perpetuate the *status quo* in our part of the world. But then, on the other hand, I have been deeply moved by the renewed pledges of support and assistance coming our way from other countries that have no hesitation in identifying themselves closely with our struggle.

112. I have, moreover, learned about the tireless efforts being employed by various United Nations bodies and departments of the Secretariat to promote the interests of the Namibian people, about the human and material resources being utilized on assistance and developmental projects and programmes under the direction of the United Nations Council for Namibia and those being implemented by the specialized agencies that are of direct benefit to our people. I am most grateful for all this and wish to urge all those institutions to continue the good work.

113. I first met you in person, Mr. President, only this year, in March, in Lusaka, the capital of your great country, but I can say that I have known you through your able leadership of the United Nations Council for Namibia since you first became its President in 1973. The record of achievements of the Council are many, and its continuing activities, in close co-operation with SWAPO, to promote further the interests of our people, are encouraging and commendable.

114. I am particularly pleased to extend to you warm greetings and best wishes on your brilliant election as President of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. I congratulate you most sincerely for your qualities as a wise and outstanding statesman and a comrade whose commitment to the total decolonization of Africa, the eradication of *apartheid* and the elimination of exploitation of man by man is second to none. You will therefore understand when I say that I am gratified to be delivering my maiden address before the General Assembly under your presidency.

115. I listened most attentively to your acceptance speech on 18 September 1984. In my view, it was a masterpiece, marked by courage, compassion and imagination. There was no mincing of words about the evil system of *apartheid* in racist South Africa. You correctly described *apartheid* as "a diabolical policy that inevitably corrupts the people and the State that practise it. *Apartheid* not only robs Africans of their basic human dignity; it is also a device that imposes a patently unacceptable white minority rule in South Africa." [*1st meeting, para. 71.*] The message was strong and convincing, if only the racist Boers and their allies had ears to hear.

116. On the question of Namibia, a subject that has for many years exercised the intellect of representatives and made continuous demands on their time and energy, their admonition to the illegal occupiers of the country and those that have arrogantly linked Namibia's independence to totally extraneous issues was timely and direct. For us, it is most regrettable that the United States Administration has now completely aligned itself with the illegal régime of Pretoria by holding Namibia's independence hostage to its imperialist regional and strategic interests, regardless of the unwarranted suffering that our people are forced to endure.

117. May I express the hope, Sir—which I do knowing that it is what my people want me to say here—that under your presidency the General Assembly will take a long, hard look at the critical situation on the ground in Namibia. Then the realization will sink in that the United Nations is being pushed to the sidelines and that the racists and their Washington allies have sinister schemes up their sleeves to bypass the Organization in favour of their own internal arrangements in Namibia. There is therefore an imperative need for a sober-minded reassessment of the role of the United Nations in the process of the decolonization of Namibia. What is required is a reinvigorated political role for the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia as the focal points in the United Nations system on the Namibian problem. It is not enough merely to catalogue racist South Africa's crimes and instances of its defiant attitude. These we have become accustomed to by now. What is of the utmost urgency is the adoption of effective measures to change the situation, which continues to drift towards even more generalized violence, loss of life and destruction of property.

118. The Security Council must meet as soon as possible in order to remove all impediments to Namibia's independence and expedite implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General needs all the encouragement and support he can get from Member States, in particular the members of the Security Council, to secure South Africa's co-operation in implementation of the United Nations plan, which has been collecting dust on the shelves for more than six years.

119. Our heartfelt thanks and commendations are due the Secretary-General for his undying efforts to hasten Namibia's independence. We recognize his difficulties, but we also know his personal commitment, which is a vital ingredient in fulfilling his heavy responsibility.

120. Now is the time for the United Nations as a whole to say "enough is enough" and to impose

comprehensive, mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, against South Africa, as an effective, peaceful way of bringing it to book.

121. We have just heard the important statement made by the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Coskun Kirca, of Turkey, who also introduced the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24*] and the recommendations contained therein. We have also heard another important statement, dealing with the activities of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, made by the Chairman of the Special Committee, Mr. Koroma, of Sierra Leone, as well as the statement of the Rapporteur of that Committee, Mr. Adhami, of the Syrian Arab Republic, introducing chapter IX of the report of the Committee [*A/39/23*], concerning Namibia. In addition, we heard the statement of the Chairman of the Group of African States, who indicated the support that Group is giving to our cause.

122. Mr. President, I wish to appeal through you to the Assembly to give its full support to the recommendations dealt with in those statements and to ensure the adoption of all the draft resolutions on Namibia. That is the minimum that the United Nations can do in response to the expectations of my people.

123. Every time a major meeting is held to deal with the problem of Namibia, we hear voices pleading for patience and moderation and repeating empty words to the effect that a breakthrough is at hand, that there is progress. Again, of late those voices have been heard from the usual discredited quarters. Actually, as far as Namibia is concerned, there has been absolutely no progress. There is a total impasse. The Namibian issue has been altogether relegated to the bottom of the priority list of the self-appointed political brokers who have usurped United Nations responsibility for the process towards Namibia's independence. In other words, all is quiet on the diplomatic front in terms of negotiations or direct talks on a cease-fire arrangement. No action, no progress; and what remains is a mere charade that can serve Pretoria's interests only, while the racist régime is trying to create new conditions for yet another *fait accompli* in preparation for a unilateral declaration of independence in Namibia.

124. South Africa's lack of political will to make a firm commitment to relinquish its colonial stranglehold on Namibia has been repeatedly demonstrated. The record of the *apartheid* junta on the issue, over many long years, remains one of prevarication, defiance and outright belligerence towards the entire world community.

125. For example, it was the Pretoria régime which sabotaged the 1981 pre-implementation meeting on Namibia, convened by the Secretary-General in order to secure an agreement between SWAPO and South Africa for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), starting with a cease-fire.

126. This year two similar meetings have been held, in Lusaka and Mindelo, on Namibia's independence. In both cases, it was once again the representative of the Pretoria régime who deliberately created confusion prior to the meetings and eventually sabotaged the independence talks. This goes to show that the illegal occupiers of our country have no intention whatsoever of finding a negotiated settlement on Namibia. The struggle will, indeed, still be long and bitter.

127. In Namibia itself, racist South Africa's organized State terrorism, generalized and violent repression and massive military buildup continue unabated. Namibians are victims of daily wanton killings, police brutality, torture, arrests and incarceration. In a nutshell, Namibia continues to be one huge Nazi-style concentration camp for the Africans. For many years now, virtually the entire country has been under martial law, reinforced by a series of abominable, illegal acts, which South Africa's colonial governor, the so-called Administrator-General, routinely imposes on our people to suppress their political demands.

128. Moreover, despite the persistent and overwhelming rejection of its diabolical policies by our people and the wider international community, the occupation régime is still attempting to set up puppet political institutions in preparation for an internal settlement, outside the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Realizing that its reactionary schemes and the local quislings of the puppet Multi-Party Conference are consistently being rejected by the Namibian patriots, the Botha régime, true to form, has recently embarked on an expensive and malicious promotion campaign abroad to popularize them. The United Nations and the rest of the world will, however, see those machinations for what they truly are and reject them.

129. We feel duty-bound to condemn once again the Reagan Administration for establishing the so-called Liaison Office in Windhoek, the capital of Namibia, in direct violation of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and against the expressed will of the oppressed people of Namibia. By its unwarranted presence in Namibia, the United States Government is lending legitimacy to the occupying régime and, even more dangerous, is slowly but surely becoming involved in the colonial conflict in our country. The United States must get out of Namibia now.

130. To add insult to injury, the racist aggressors, while still stubbornly insisting, in collusion with the United States Administration, on the notorious linkage pre-condition—thereby creating a major stumbling-block to our freedom—decided recently to impose military conscription on all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve in the occupying colonial army in a sinister and dangerous attempt to "Namibianize" the conflict by forcing brother to kill brother.

131. Those very same evil forces are busy ripping up the three-branch railway lines that connect strategic points in Namibia, in the areas of Gobabis, Outjo and Lüderitz. This destructive action is clearly illegal, since racist South Africa illegally occupies Namibia and all its actions in relation to the Territory are illegal. In addition to sowing the seeds of civil and racial conflicts in Namibia, Pretoria has already started to cripple the country's infrastructure in a piecemeal fashion in order to push the Government of an independent Namibia into a subservient position of dependency. There is also the fast-growing problem of foreign debts which Pretoria is incessantly accumulating in the name of Namibia, in the hope of leaving this heavy burden behind for the Namibian nation to deal with. The Government of an independent Namibia will definitely not be responsible for those debts. Of course, the plunder of

Namibia's natural resources and the exploitation of our labour force are going on in full swing, benefiting exclusively the racists, their Western allies and the transnational corporations.

132. We challenge those who run around talking about progress and breakthroughs in Namibia to show us concrete evidence in support of their claims. For us, the situation has gone from bad to worse. As a matter of fact, we are now faced with a grave situation which is being exacerbated further by the latest moves of the racists. The United Nations must respond urgently and decisively to this situation before everything goes up in flames.

133. It is against this background that, with all the seriousness at my command, I urge the United Nations and the rest of progressive mankind to redouble their efforts to help us liberate Namibia.

134. There is a division of labour in this common struggle. SWAPO is more determined than ever to intensify further the political, military and diplomatic struggles. There is no way out of this for us. We have accepted the challenge to be our own liberators.

135. Similarly, the United Nations, which has assumed direct responsibility for Namibia, and particularly the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the country until independence, must truly rise to the challenge posed by the continued colonial oppression, illegal occupation and military aggression in our country. The primary challenge is racist South Africa's persistent defiance and prevarication. Our collective determination must be greater than that challenge in order to achieve the noble goal of Namibia's independence. Until that goal is achieved fully, there cannot be any room for wavering, hesitation or confusion about what has to be done.

136. On the wider international plane, we are greatly encouraged to see that the Organization of African Unity, which has now re-emerged with a clear direction and reinvigorated commitment, has adopted an important statement of principles on southern Africa and a strong resolution on Namibia to which I invite the Assembly's attention. In this context, I wish to refer to the latest developments in the region of south-west Africa which affect Angola and Namibia.

137. With the circulation of a letter dated 17 November 1984 [*A/39/688*] from Mr. José Eduardo dos Santos, President of the People's Republic of Angola, to the Secretary-General, all the confusion and misrepresentation regarding Angola's position in the current negotiations have been removed. The Angolan Government's firm position on the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of Angola has been reiterated. At the same time, Angola has once again demonstrated flexibility and the political will to find amicable solutions to the problems of our region, including the rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO supports Angola's position and will continue to do its very best to strengthen further co-operation between itself, the MPLA[4]-Workers' Party and the fraternal people of Angola. On the other hand, there is racist South Africa's objectionable letter, which has also been circulated as a reply to Angola's constructive proposals. It offers nothing new and must be rejected.

138. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, too, has renewed its pledge to continue and increase all forms of support and assistance to SWAPO. In welcoming that principled expression of solidarity—for which we are most grateful—we remember the lasting contribution made to our struggle by the Chairman of that Movement, the late Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

139. It goes without saying that the community of socialist countries has consistently rendered, and continues to render, massive all-round assistance to SWAPO, which has enabled us to advance the struggle to the present stage.

140. On the other hand, we are proud recipients of generous and invaluable humanitarian aid, especially from the Nordic countries, the Netherlands and other friendly countries in the West. We trust that this exemplary co-operation will continue, even after Namibia's independence.

141. Our friends and supporters in the numerous non-governmental organizations, as well as committed individuals, have for many years always played an indispensable role in the struggle. Their time, energy and creativity have been dutifully combined to strengthen people-to-people contact and co-operation.

142. All these Governments, parliaments, organizations and peoples have stood with us in this long and bitter struggle. We continue to count on them to remain resolute in the work and be generous, as always, in assisting us.

143. In conclusion, I should be failing in my duty if I did not from this rostrum renew SWAPO's unwavering and comradely solidarity with and support for the heroic struggles of the peoples of Western Sahara, led by the Frente POLISARIO[5] and its Government, the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic; of Palestine, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization, who must be supported until they have established their own independent state; of Puerto Rico and their vanguard socialist party; and of South Africa and their liberation movement, led by the ANC. We share the daily agonies of the valiant people of South Africa. Our destinies have been linked by history and geography and the circumstances of the common struggle against the common enemy: *apartheid* South Africa.

144. In the mean time, until the final victory, which will surely come, sooner rather than later, and in spite of the unholy alliance between Pretoria and Washington, the struggle continues. Victory is certain.

145. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): Next year there will be two important anniversaries: the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

146. Looking back at the activities of the United Nations, one outstanding achievement certainly looms large and that is the anti-colonial revolution under the aegis of the United Nations. The wave of independence and freedom has substantially altered the political map of the world, the membership of the United Nations and the United Nations itself. Its role in the process of decolonization is one of the brightest pages in the history of the world Organization.

147. Looking towards the future and the future activities of the United Nations, there are overwhelming and just demands to be met in the urgent completion of the process of decolonization. Those demands are made in the light of the fact that the

United Nations has been the firmest stronghold of the struggle for independence of those under colonial domination. The United Nations should remain such a stronghold.

148. The people of Namibia are still deprived of their inalienable rights to freedom, independence and self-determination. Colonial occupation, terror and exploitation by the South African régime continue, causing immense human suffering. The illegal occupying régime continues the arrests and murders of Namibian patriots, fighters and supporters of SWAPO. Through the use of various forms of pressure and threats, the citizens of Namibia are made to leave their homes, and large numbers are living in refugee camps in neighbouring countries.

149. The illegal occupying régime is brazenly violating the human rights of the Namibian people. South Africa is trying to carry out its policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in Namibia as well. It is turning a deaf ear to the demands of the international community for the eradication of *apartheid*. Moreover, it is trying to spread it beyond its borders.

150. In order to weaken the struggle of the people of Namibia, there are attempts to divide it and to introduce bantustanization. Every attempt is being made to secure prolongation of the occupation and domination. There are also attempts to establish puppet political institutions in Namibia, such as the so-called Multi-Party Conference. These and other so-called internal solutions have been rightfully rejected by the international community as attempts to impose a neo-colonial solution in Namibia.

151. The recent forced conscription of Namibians into the occupying army is another attempt to undermine the liberation struggle and to involve the people of Namibia in a fratricidal war.

152. The ruthless exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia by South Africa and by transnational corporations companies. This constitutes a flagrant violation of the rights of Namibians freely to dispose of their natural and economic potential and is contrary to United Nations decisions, in particular Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

153. All these attempts to obstruct the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia have not succeeded and cannot succeed. For 100 years, Namibians have been fighting heroically against colonial occupation. These 100 years have been years of suffering and sacrifice but also years of belief and resolve that freedom will not remain just a dream. With such conviction, the people of Namibia will never be thrown to its knees, nor will its struggle be quelled.

154. SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, has for years been at the helm and in the thick and thin of the struggle for self-determination and national independence. SWAPO is leading the people and fighting for the people; it is a true people's organization.

155. Nothing attracts the support of the international community as much as the will and determination to fight for independence and self-determination. The struggle of the Namibian people has received international recognition, respect and support. The participation of SWAPO in the work of the United Nations and other international organizations and its membership in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries are expressions of that support. SWAPO, while waging a heroic struggle on the battlefield, has in the political arena shown a full measure of statesmanship and has consistently given the United Nations full co-operation in all matters pertaining to implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

156. We are glad to see in this Hall the Secretary-General of SWAPO, Mr. Toivo ya Toivo. After 16 years in gaol in South Africa—a gaol within a gaol for fighters for independence and freedom—he is again, together with the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, leading his movement and his people in the battle. At this point it may be appropriate to recall the words that Mr. Toivo ya Toivo uttered after his release from prison: "Although I have been released, I am not free yet until my people and country are free."

157. The situation in Namibia poses a threat to peace and security in the region, in the entire continent of Africa and beyond it. The prolongation of the occupation and of acts of aggression against both Namibia and the front-line States carries the danger of increasing interference by non-regional factors.

158. On many an occasion, there has been the broadest consensus on the need for the urgent and unconditional attainment of independence by Namibia. Most expressly this position was seen in the Security Council, when it endorsed the United Nations plan for Namibia, later reaffirmed by the General Assembly.

159. None the less, South Africa defies the will of the international community and refuses to comply with these decisions, trying to prevent or at least postpone the attainment of independence by Namibia. Insisting on linking Namibian independence with the presence of foreign troops in Angola, South Africa has been blocking implementation of the United Nations plan. This linkage is designed further to deny freedom to Namibians, to prolong the illegal occupation of Namibia and to prolong the exploitation of its human and natural resources.

160. It is high time for the United Nations to proceed with resolute action and fulfil its direct responsibility for Namibia. All Member States should firmly endeavour to bring about, as a matter of urgency, the settlement of the question of Namibia on the basis of the United Nations plan for Namibia, which is the only basis for a peaceful solution. The United Nations plan should be implemented without delay.

161. However, it does not seem to be enough at this stage to support the United Nations plan. It has not proved to be sufficient for its implementation. Determination should be shown to use other means to bring about the independence of Namibia.

162. The Security Council has the central role in the implementation of the United Nations plan. The Council should monitor the issue, intervene on a timely basis, remove all obstacles and take all measures that are at its disposal.

163. The Secretary-General should receive our full support in fulfilling his mandate on the Namibian issue.

164. We feel that it is necessary to put renewed pressure on South Africa and to refrain from any contacts or co-operation with that régime. This implies the adoption of mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, which would entail, in addition to the arms embargo,

the immediate cessation of any form of economic, military, political, cultural or scientific co-operation with South Africa, as well as co-operation in sports.

165. It is our duty, furthermore, to render effective political, moral and material assistance and support to the Namibian people and to its liberation movement, SWAPO. Their resolve and determination and their goal make this support a duty for the international community.

166. At their meeting held in New York from 1 to 5 October, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly renewed their determination to convene an extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, not later than April 1985 [*A/39/560, annex, para. 43*]. This to our mind is another manifestation of the solidarity of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the people of Namibia and its support for the heroic struggle of that people.

167. The international community should also help the front-line States, which are exposed to attacks on their territorial integrity, security and national economies by the régime in Pretoria.

168. In the present situation, the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia are becoming even more important and the support of all Member States for the activities of the Council even more essential. The Council, working under your presidency, Sir, as the Ambassador of Zambia, has initiated and successfully carried out numerous actions aimed at ensuring the implementation of the United Nations plan, achieving independence for Namibia and rendering help to the Namibian people, to SWAPO and to their legitimate struggle for independence. You have given us wise and able guidance in the Council.

169. We feel that the Council should continue its work to strengthen international support for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and to ensure the aid and assistance of Governments and non-governmental organizations.

170. There are, however, a number of things that remain necessary; among them are further action in support of the struggle of the Namibian people and SWAPO, further legal action to protect the interests of the Namibian people, further action to secure prisoner-of-war status for captured freedom fighters in Namibia, and the adoption of other measures.

171. We feel it is also necessary to strengthen support for the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia. These institutions are carrying out diversified and essential programmes of assistance to the people of Namibia, particularly in the social and educational fields.

172. The activities of foreign economic, financial and other interests in the Territory of Namibia are a direct obstacle to its political independence. All countries, transnational corporations and other organizations that are exploring and exploiting the natural resources of Namibia should immediately cease their activities in the Territory, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands. The illegal exploitation of these resources, in the sea and on the land, is in clear violation of Decree No. 1.

173. For its part, Yugoslavia will continue to render support to the struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, until they achieve freedom and independence. We in Yugoslavia consider this support an obligation arising from our own history and our own struggle for independence and resulting from the ideals and principles that we have been guided by in our own fight for freedom and in the period following it.

174. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Yugoslavia will continue to make its full contribution to its work.

175. We feel that the United Nations and the entire international community bear a historical responsibility regarding the independence of Namibia. The solution of this issue would end the suffering of the people of Namibia and enable them to live in freedom and independence. It would also provide an incentive for a general relaxation of tensions and for enhancing the stability of international relations.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

[3] See A/40/87, annex, resolution AHG/Res.125 (XX).

[4] Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.

[5] Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

79th PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 29 November 1984, at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): The Government and people of India take considerable pride in the fact that, 39 years ago, at the very first session of the General Assembly, our delegation was among the first to raise the question of Namibia, then known as South West Africa, in this forum. The question of Namibia thus belongs to that category of issues of overriding importance that, in this forum, are as old as the United Nations itself. India's interest and active involvement in promoting the Namibian cause are equally rooted in history.

2. However, what we do not consider a matter of pride—indeed, none of us in the Assembly could consider a matter of pride—is the continued inability of the United Nations to put an end to the terrible ordeal of the Namibian people in spite of the nearly four decades of endeavour towards that objective. The delay in bringing about the independence of Namibia is all the more unconscionable in the light of the fact that for nearly two of those four decades Namibia has been a direct and unique responsibility of the United Nations. For over six years now, a universally endorsed settlement plan for Namibia, adopted by the Security Council with much hope at that time, has remained a dead letter. The failure of the United Nations to give effect to its own resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia constitutes the biggest blot on the otherwise commendable record of the Organization in the field of decolonization and has, indeed, cast a shadow on its very credibility.

3. Why is it that, in spite of years of concerted international effort aimed at liberating Namibia from the colonial yoke, we should have to countenance the frustration of having to witness—or rather, deplore—the completion of a century of colonialism in that country this year?

4. Our tribute to the valiant people of Namibia on the occasion of one hundred years of struggle cannot but be tinged with a sense of disappointment, even a feeling of shame, that Namibia's ordeal should have been allowed to last so long. How is it, we must once again ask, that the sustained and unanimous demand of the international community for the independence of Namibia is rebuffed repeatedly and persistently? Why does the United Nations find itself—and why do we, the vast majority of the international community, find ourselves—so impotent in the face of such arrogant defiance of resolutions and decisions of the Assembly and of the Security Council, of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and of the universal will?

5. The reasons are not far to seek. They lie first and foremost in the very nature of the racist régime of Pretoria, which has habitually treated with scorn and contempt the will of the international community in remorselessly pursuing the obnoxious policy of *apartheid* within South Africa, continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and repeatedly indulging in wanton acts of aggression and destabilization directed against independent African States. We all realized long ago that the Pretoria régime did not subscribe to recognized norms of State conduct and that moral suasion could have no impact on it.

6. The reasons for South Africa's intransigence must lie also in the support, overt and tacit, that the racist régime has received from its powerful friends and allies. Through political and diplomatic support and continued co-operation with South Africa in various fields of activity, certain Governments have helped to shield South Africa from international pressure and, indeed, served to create a situation in which South Africa has felt encouraged to pursue defiantly its reprehensible policies. Indeed, the hiatus between the professed commitment of those countries to bringing about the independence of Namibia, on the one hand, and their actual deeds, on the other, has proved to be a crucial impediment to the international effort to isolate and put pressure upon South Africa.

7. I need hardly dilate on the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, which has been firm, consistent and unequivocal. That position was reiterated most recently at the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984. The non-aligned countries have always supported the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia. We believe that the Namibian people are fully justified in carrying on their struggle by every means at their disposal, including armed struggle. We

recognize the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*] as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. SWAPO is a full member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

8. The non-aligned countries believe that the United Nations bears primary responsibility for Namibia and that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) represents the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. That resolution must be implemented immediately and unconditionally and without the introduction of irrelevant and extraneous elements. We deplore South Africa's repeated attempts to undermine the responsibility of the United Nations and to circumvent resolution 435 (1978) through attempts at an internal settlement. We have urged the Security Council to meet once again and to assume fully its responsibilities, including taking urgent action to ensure implementation of its own decisions, if necessary by the adoption of enforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

9. South Africa has demonstrated time and again its utter lack of sincerity and seriousness in the course of the negotiations relating to Namibia's independence. In spite of the admirable spirit of compromise and accommodation shown by SWAPO in the diplomatic arena, South Africa's attitude has been characterized by duplicity and prevarication. Flimsy pretexts and irrelevant considerations have repeatedly been adduced to subvert agreement and to renege on commitment. The rupture of the Namibian independence talks at Lusaka and Mindelo earlier this year constitutes the most recent evidence of Pretoria's bad faith and subterfuge.

10. The letter dated 17 November 1984 from the President of the People's Republic of Angola to the Secretary-General [*A/39/688*], which has now been brought to our attention, together with the letter of 23 November 1984 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa to the Secretary-General [*A/39/689*], makes it clear that, even in these negotiations between Angola and South Africa, the Pretoria régime is pursuing the same policy of deception and prevarication, notwithstanding the flexible and positive attitude taken by Angola.

11. We consider it imperative that any efforts made outside the framework of the United Nations to find a way out of the current impasse must be in consonance with the United Nations plan and must lead to the early and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Such efforts should serve to reinforce those of the United Nations, not run counter to them or undermine them in any manner.

12. We wish to place on record our appreciation of the efforts made by the Secretary-General towards bringing about the independence of Namibia. His deep personal commitment to the Namibian cause is well known. He needs the support of all of us in discharging his difficult mandate. We reiterate to him our pledge of full co-operation.

13. Allow me also to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under your stewardship, Sir, continues energetically to carry out its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence and to promote the Namibian cause. The report of the Council [*A/39/24*] provides eloquent testimony to the active role of the Council in continually monitoring the situation in and around Namibia and organizing manifold activities designed to mobilize further international awareness of and support for the Namibian cause. As a Vice-President and founding member of the Council, India has contributed its mite to the Council's activities. We would also like to express our deep appreciation to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Brajesh Mishra, for his continuing devoted service to the Namibian cause.

14. I began my statement with a recollection of the fact that my country was a pioneer in espousing the cause of Namibia's independence, as indeed we were in imposing comprehensive voluntary sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. About a month ago, on that fateful day when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was assassinated, I had the sad privilege of forwarding to the Symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle by the Namibian People against Colonialism a message from Mrs. Gandhi pledging the unflinching support of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of India to SWAPO and the people of Namibia and sending her good wishes for the success of the Symposium. That message was one of the last official acts of the Prime Minister. It will remain eternal testimony to Mrs. Gandhi's deep personal attachment to the cause of the Namibian people as, indeed, to that of all peoples under colonial subjugation. So will it remain a manifestation of the abiding solidarity of the Government and people of India and of the entire Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with our brothers and sisters in Namibia. We know that they will ultimately prevail.

15. Mr. SUCRE-FIGARELLA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is with great satisfaction that the delegation of Venezuela is once again participating in the General Assembly debate on such an important issue as the question of Namibia. We find the report submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on the activities entrusted to it by the Assembly extremely interesting; it shows the great sense of responsibility and dedication with which the Council has carried out its task.

16. Venezuela, as a member of that Council, has endeavoured to work in a spirit of solidarity consistent with its clear-cut international position, which is to do everything in our power to enable the people of Namibia to enjoy their full right to independence, putting an end to the outrage of colonial domination by South Africa, which refuses to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

17. For many long years we have wondered whether the express mandate of the United Nations calling for the independence of Namibia would succeed or fail.

18. In the present report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, an account is given of the most recent events that have taken place in connection with that question. We note with regret and indignation that South Africa's answer has been to maintain its intransigent refusal to comply with the request of the international community.

19. The initiatives taken by the Secretary-General to give practical effect to the Security Council's mandate are clear proof that all his tireless, unremitting efforts, which have been carried out to the full satisfaction of the Organization, have been to no avail in the face of the insistence of the colonialist South African Government on distorting the specific nature of the problem. There can be no justification

for refusing to grant independence to Namibia. It is a legitimate right that stands on its own merit, since it derives from the principles of the Charter, which govern the very existence of the United Nations.

20. My delegation considers that Namibia's independence brooks no further delay. Elections must be called immediately and the electoral system governing those elections established forthwith. It is unacceptable that the South African Government should have refused to set a reasonable period for the calling of elections in accordance with the United Nations request, a failure that is recorded by the Secretary-General in his further report of 29 December 1983.[1]

21. Thus we are faced with a reality that is difficult to change and which shows how insufficient the enforcement measures are which are available to the United Nations for the achievement of its ends.

22. All the sanctions laid down in the various resolutions have proved ineffective simply because the spirit of co-operation to comply with them has been lacking. Venezuela, for its part, has been categorical and firm in applying sanctions to isolate the colonialist South African régime. But what can one country do when other countries do not have the same determination?

23. The strength of the United Nations depends on the will of all its Members. It is quite clear that the Namibian question will not be solved unless we understand this fact. If complete co-ordination of economic, diplomatic, cultural and military actions against the country that is violating international commitments were put into effect, there is no doubt that a favourable solution in the not-too-distant future could be attained.

24. It is true that there are geo-political problems in the region which complicate the issue. Domestic strife in several areas bordering on Namibia create a climate of tension which does not favour understanding. But who can seriously deny that racism and colonialism, the heinous practices of the Government of South Africa, are connected with these circumstantial geo-political tensions? Those tensions have existed for a very long time. The reverse would be true in this instance: if such practices were to be eliminated, the effect of their removal would be to create more favourable conditions for dialogue and thus facilitate the achievement of peace and stability in the region.

25. We therefore appeal once again to the conscience of all countries to ensure that, in dealing with the question of Namibia, they will abide consistently by the principles of international justice and morality. If they proceed thus, peace may be closer at hand and more easily achieved than many believe.

26. If the occupation of Namibia by South African forces is allowed to continue, it could well lead to a much broader conflict. Each day the people of Namibia are more determined to defend their rights. Their decision to fight for independence by any means is backed by a resolve that should give us food for thought if we wish to avoid greater suffering for that country. The heroism of the Namibian people is something that should be recognized by the international community, because those people participate actively and consciously in the struggle for their legitimate rights. That is why the international community should press for an acceptable solution as soon as possible, inasmuch as the problems being discussed here could lead to a climate of greater tension.

27. The problem of Namibia, as is well known, is not just one of its independence. It involves the worst excesses of racism, exploitation, of what is called *apartheid*, excesses which are offensive to the conscience of mankind. To insist on maintaining a state of affairs that is liable to criticism is to minimize the effectiveness of the United Nations.

28. We were happy to receive the news of the recent release of Comrade Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, who for 16 years was detained in the gaols of *apartheid* and colonialism. Many of those years he spent in the infamous Robben Island prison, where after a sham trial he served time for the crime of defending the sacred right of Namibia to independence. We hail this triumph, and through it we regain the strength to continue this struggle for independence against the South African racists.

29. Of course, we must not underestimate the fact that, in the process aimed at achieving Namibia's independence, important progress has been made, especially in the manner in which peoples and Governments perceive the problem. There is no doubt that there is a wider awareness of its implications than in the past and that the number of countries which take seriously their responsibilities *vis-à-vis* Namibia is increasing considerably.

30. As far as Venezuela is concerned, I wish to confirm here that our participation in the United Nations Council for Namibia, as I recalled at the beginning of my statement, has been based on our constant concern for the total and definitive independence of that region. Our attitude has been proclaimed in all forums, and no opportunity is missed to emphasize arguments consistent with our practices. Repetition, in a case such as this, does not diminish the importance of the facts. On the contrary, it obliges diplomacy to find a solution.

31. The fact is that, since the creation of the United Nations Council for Namibia under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, after the Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, had declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations with regard to the administration of the Territory of Namibia, the attributes accorded the Council have turned it into a truly authoritative body capable of representing the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. Their missions of consultation abroad to discuss problems with Governments in different regions, such as the missions in 1984 to Latin America, Western Europe and the Pacific region, have helped the international community to understand that in the Council they have a true interlocutor and champion of the rights of Namibia.

32. In this connection, my delegation attaches great importance to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which provides for action to terminate the exploitation and plundering of natural and human resources by foreign economic interests in defiance of United Nations resolutions.

33. Despite all the difficulties, the obduracy of the Government of South Africa and the geo-political complications that may have arisen, it is a fact that the United Nations Council for Namibia has wisely prepared a transition period that will ensure for the Namibian people in its inevitable future, when it

achieves independence, sounder bases to guarantee its own development.

34. The comprehensive action of the Council has been oriented towards guaranteeing the emergence of a free nation committed to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The level of representation of the Council within the Organization is one way of fully recognizing its true value, and that has given it the necessary backing so as to provide the Namibian people with real possibilities of achieving its historic objectives.

35. The Council has not merely denounced abuses against the Namibian people. With a true vision of the future, it has co-ordinated the tasks aimed at creating a highly civilized State. This policy includes technical training of cadres, co-operation with representative political forces and the organization of seminars and forums where current problems relating to subsequent stages of Namibia's development can be discussed.

36. Among these tangible achievements of the Council, we are especially gratified, in our capacity as Vice-Chairman of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, to declare open the United Nations Vocational Training Centre for Namibia where 200 Namibian refugees, in the province of Kwanza Sul, in the People's Republic of Angola, are carrying out basic studies in automobile mechanics, carpentry and other basic skills necessary for the efficient functioning of independent Namibia.

37. In this connection, we are committed to and participate in the work of the United Nations Institute for Namibia, based in Lusaka, where Namibians are also preparing for the future task of leading their country.

38. Never before has the United Nations had such a clear understanding of its responsibilities. In a difficult and tragic situation it is doing everything in its power to give to persons living in their own territory, unlawfully occupied by others, the assurance that they do not stand alone and that the international community understands the need to establish an effective degree of co-operation. The right of Namibia to freedom is being recognized not only with words but also with deeds.

39. I am convinced that history will record this as one of the most meritorious undertakings of the United Nations: the creation of a world free from its worst enemies. May I express on this occasion to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia—today President of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly—Mr. Paul Lusaka, our deep satisfaction at the work he has done for the goals that speak so highly of international solidarity.

40. It is clear that the more intensified the steps taken and the greater the understanding of the problem, officially and individually, the more the pressure on the South African régime will become unbearable. Despite the disappointments and setbacks, the credibility of the United Nations, through its direct intervention in the question of Namibia, is still at an acceptable level.

41. In the Council's daily work we have benefitted from the constructive criticism and suggestions of Comrade Toivo ya Toivo on the Council's activities. Thus, in the Council we supported the idea that the Council should continue to work with a view to ensuring better protection for Namibia's natural resources, the use of a greater number of Namibians in the Council's work, and greater contacts between the Council and current Namibian realities by means of visits to refugee camps for Namibians.

42. That is why it is desirable to initiate next year an even more intensive campaign, so that, when we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we can do away with all the heavy burdens imposed on these people who have been deprived of their rights for so long.

43. We wish to emphasize the efficient and skilful work of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Brajesh Mishra, and the members of his office, to whom we express our gratitude.

44. May I take this opportunity to convey to the non-governmental organizations concerned with the promotion of the Namibian cause our sincere gratitude and encouragement for their work.

45. In view of our commitment to the Council's work, and taking into account what we have said in this statement, the Venezuelan delegation will unreservedly support the draft resolutions proposed by the Council in its report [*see A/39/24, part four*].

46. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): One of the items which has been given the greatest attention in the General Assembly is the question of Namibia. The Assembly and a number of subsidiary bodies have considered the evolution of the situation of that Territory starting from the establishment of the mandate, which was revoked by the General Assembly on 27 October 1966, at which time the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory and the people of Namibia. In 1967, the General Assembly established as a subsidiary body the United Nations Council for Namibia, to which it gave the role of legal Administering Authority of that Territory until independence.

47. Since the General Assembly does not have the necessary powers to ensure the withdrawal of the foreign administration, it decided to bring the matter to the Security Council. Thus, in resolutions dating as long ago as 1969, the Security Council recognized the termination of the mandate and requested the Government of South Africa to withdraw immediately from that Territory.

48. The International Court of Justice has on repeated occasions examined the international status of the Territory of Namibia and the legal consequences deriving therefrom. That principal United Nations organ has recognized since 1950 the competence of the General Assembly as regards that status and, as is well known, in 1971 issued an advisory opinion[3] stating both the obligation of South Africa to put an end to its unlawful presence by withdrawing its administration from the Territory of Namibia and of States Members of the United Nations to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence.

49. Those obligations entail the duty not to establish conventional relations in those cases in which the Government of South Africa would presume to act on behalf of Namibia or in respect of that Territory; not to accredit in South Africa diplomatic or consular missions the jurisdiction of which might extend to Namibia and not to send consular agents to that Territory; not to maintain relations which might strengthen South Africa's authority in Namibia; and

to recall that the unlawful presence of South Africa is prejudicial to a people which needs the assistance of the international community to achieve the objectives corresponding to the sacred task of civilization.

50. The content of that advisory opinion reflected the legal elements at play, all of which have been reiterated repeatedly as being mandatory by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General. The direct responsibility of the United Nations, which is recognized both politically and juridically, includes promoting the well-being, development and progress of the Namibian people and safeguarding their rights and interests. Those objectives can only be achieved through the self-determination and true independence of the Namibian people in the face of external pressure or attempts at external pressure, which come or may come from different ideological horizons.

51. Thus, in 1978, the Security Council adopted a resolution laying down the modalities for free elections which, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, would guarantee the expression of all trends of thought among the Namibian population, so as to ensure true free determination, while creating a democratic, pluralistic and united society.

52. Honduras is taking part in this debate in order to say that we are aware of the duties incumbent upon all States Members of the United Nations deriving from the responsibilities that the United Nations has assumed *vis-à-vis* the people and Territory of Namibia.

53. Honduras has repeatedly expressed its views on this situation. During the general debate, on 9 October, our Minister for Foreign Affairs reiterated those views before the Assembly when he said:

> "Honduras rejects the presence of foreign troops in Namibia and deplores the delay in establishing an independent, sovereign State. The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia is the basis for a lasting, peaceful solution." [*26th meeting, para. 227*.]

54. Eighteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa, subsequently proclaimed and known as Namibia, and six years have elapsed since the United Nations plan to ensure peaceful transition towards independence for the Namibian people was adopted.

55. Honduras supported the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly aimed at concluding as soon as possible all the arrangements relating to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and the peaceful settlement of the question on the basis of the immediate implementation of those resolutions, thus avoiding any attempt to hamper the process that would lead to that end.

56. But what has happened to date? Despite the pronouncements of the organs I have referred to concerning the international status of the Territory and the illegality of the presence of South Africa, in spite of the fact that there is a United Nations plan, accepted by the Republic of South Africa itself, for the peaceful transition to independence of Namibia, in spite of the fact that the General Assembly and the Security Council continue to adopt resolutions which express the concern of the international community at the continued unlawful occupation of the Territory of Namibia, in spite of all the foregoing, the occupying country has not permitted the implementation of that United Nations plan and continues to violate the rights and fundamental freedoms of the Namibians, including their right to exercise permanent sovereignty over the natural resources of the Territory.

57. We must not be discouraged by this situation. Rather, as representatives of States Members of the United Nations, we must exercise our right, which derives from our special responsibility for Namibia, to participate in the collective and institutional activities carried out through United Nations bodies in order to achieve as soon as possible the objectives we set for ourselves when we assumed that responsibility.

58. In this connection, we should give full support to the efforts of the Secretary-General and, as he requested, we must agree that the question of Namibia should be considered as a priority question in its own right and that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) continues to be the sole basis for a solution. We should also reaffirm that all agreements and arrangements arrived at to date by the United Nations remain valid and in force. Therefore, we must give full support and co-operation to the Secretary-General so that he may pursue and intensify his efforts to achieve a rapid solution to the Namibian question.

59. Honduras reiterates its conviction that we should not establish any link or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and matters that are extraneous to that question and which were not taken into account when the United Nations plan for Namibia was adopted. Nothing should be allowed to delay independence.

60. However, as we have stated on other occasions, Honduras cannot disregard the fact that there are elements of insecurity and tension in the southern part of Africa and that those conflicts must be resolved peacefully for the benefit of the peace and security to which all States without exception in that part of the world are entitled. This would also promote the consolidation of the expected independence of Namibia, which, let me say again, should not be delayed or hindered by conditions relating to the achievement of this ultimate regional objective. We therefore agree with the views of other Members of the United Nations, such as, for instance, Austria, whose representative, in his statement at the thirty-eighth session, on 29 November 1983, said:

> "such elements should not be linked to the United Nations transition plan for Namibia but should rather be discussed directly with the interested Governments in an overall effort to reduce tensions and to put an end to the conflict in the area as a whole, perhaps including appropriate guarantees for the territorial integrity of the States concerned". [*75th meeting, para. 173*.]

61. The international reality shows that those contacts and negotiations are already under way.

62. The search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question must be accelerated, given the justified impatience of the Namibian people. That is why we emphasize that it is desirable to give the Secretary-General the greatest possible support in his actions aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Contact Group can co-operate in expediting the attainment of a solution to the conflict, which derives from the foreign occupation of Namibian territory.

63. In the meantime, we should strengthen the international status of Namibia by encouraging acceptance of the participation of its representative, the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is under the competent direction of Mr. Lusaka, as a full member in the largest possible number of specialized agencies and bodies of the United Nations system, as is already the case, for instance, with the IAEA, ITU and the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Similarly, we should advocate the participation of Namibia as a party to international treaties of primary importance, as has happened in the case of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [*resolution 2106A (XX), annex*], the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [*resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex*] and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.[4]

64. Assistance in the training of the Namibian people should continue to ensure maximum self-sufficiency. Support for the United Nations Council for Namibia in all its activities, as well as for the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia, should be strengthened. All co-operation with the State occupying the Territory of Namibia in the way of assistance that would help it to maintain or strengthen its illegal presence in that Territory should cease.

65. To this end, conferences, symposia and seminars should be held in different regions of the world in order to bring to the attention of public opinion in all continents the duty of the international community to ensure the rapid accession to independence of Namibia through the genuine self-determination of its people by means of free, impartial elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

66. It is to be hoped that the solution to the problem of Namibia will, at the latest, coincide with the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. Let us remember that by 1985, almost 40 years will have elapsed since we began to deal with the question of Namibia. We must therefore regard it as one of our priority questions, and we must strengthen our efforts to bring this question, and our direct responsibility with regard to it, to a conclusion, thus providing yet further proof that, in the words of the Charter, the United Nations is in a position "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

67. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Since the beginning of this year, two rounds of talks have been held, in Lusaka and Cape Verde, respectively, between the South African colonial authorities and SWAPO, which represents the Namibian people. However, owing to the lack of sincerity on the part of the South African authorities, these talks have produced no results, with no progress made whatsoever in the process towards the independence of Namibia. Now, not only do the Namibian people continue to live in an abyss of misery under South Africa's colonialist rule, but the sovereignty of the already independent countries in southern Africa has been subjected to repeated encroachments, and the situation in the region as a whole remains unsettled. Facts show that the root cause of tension in southern Africa lies in the South African authorities' flat refusal to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions and abandon their colonial rule over Namibia, and in their persistent pursuance of regional hegemonism.

68. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has provided a realistic basis for a reasonable settlement of the Namibian question and attainment of independence by Namibia. According to this resolution, South African troops and SWAPO guerrillas should cease their hostilities, South African troops should gradually withdraw from Namibia, the Namibian people should hold elections under United Nations supervision, and the country would achieve complete independence. This settlement formula has been universally accepted by the Namibian people and the international community and was once accepted by the South African authorities as well. However, six years have passed and this solemn United Nations resolution remains to this day a mere scrap of paper, without being translated into action.

69. The key to the settlement of the Namibian question lies in terminating South African colonial rule so that the Namibian people may enjoy the inalienable right to self-determination and independence which they ought to enjoy. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) adheres to those principles while taking into account the many aspects of the realities both within and outside Namibia. In the course of negotiations, SWAPO, which represents the Namibian people, has over the years always taken a reasonable and constructive approach, demonstrating patience and flexibility to the greatest extent. But the South African authorities have stubbornly stuck to their colonialist position, constantly varying their tricks and resorting to both hard and soft tactics to delay the settlement of the question in order to protect their own strategic and economic interests in Namibia and preserve the system of *apartheid* in South Africa itself.

70. Intensifying their military repression, they have recently forced all males between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve with the South African occupation troops. In order to strengthen their political rule, they have fostered puppet representatives and refused to recognize SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, as acknowledged by the United Nations. They are attempting to steer clear of the United Nations under the cover of a "regional settlement" and to proceed with their own plans.

71. Moreover, having stalled for a long time, they still refuse to withdraw their troops from Angola, following their invasion, and insist on linking the independence of Namibia with Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola and making the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) conditional on this troop withdrawal. Boasting that theirs is the only powerful military force in southern Africa, they have wantonly subjected neighbouring countries to their invasion and threats. These arbitrary acts of regional hegemonism perpetrated by the South African authorities have not only met with rejection by SWAPO and the African front-line States, but also have aroused the bitter resentment and indignation of the international community.

72. The struggle of the Namibian people has received extensive sympathy and support from all the countries and peoples in the world that uphold justice. At the Summit Meeting of the Front-line States held at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania,

on 29 April 1984, the African front-line States reiterated their support for the Namibian people's struggle for independence. In June, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the African front-line States and the Nordic countries held a meeting in Stockholm to voice their support for the people of southern Africa in their struggle for liberation. In early September, the African front-line States and the Socialist International held a meeting at Arusha. The twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November, and the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October, both reiterated that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the basis for the settlement of the Namibian question, expressed opposition to linkage of any kind and voiced resolute support for the just struggle of the Namibian people. In the past year, the United Nations Council for Namibia, under your dynamic guidance, Mr. President, has made new efforts for the cause of the liberation of the Namibian people.

73. It should be pointed out that the intransigence of the South African authorities is inseparable from a big Power's policy of "constructive engagement" towards South Africa and its insistence on a settlement that links Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola with the independence of Namibia. We hold that it should abandon the practice that inflates the arrogance of South Africa and runs counter to the aspirations of the vast majority of African countries and the international community as a whole, so that it may discharge its responsibilities in strict observance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

74. Namibia covers an area of over 820,000 square kilometres and has a population of more than a million. Subjected to colonialist oppression for over a century, it remains today under the rule of the South African racist régime and is the largest colony left on earth. This is a disgrace to the human society of the 1980s. We wish to call on all States Members of the United Nations strictly to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in the interest of the early achievement of the independence of Namibia, to carry out the Security Council resolution on an arms embargo against South Africa and to observe Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. As regards the South African authorities, who refuse to abide by the relevant Security Council resolutions, sanctions should be taken against them in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

75. I wish to reiterate here that the Chinese Government and people vehemently condemn the racist authorities of South Africa for their illegal occupation of Namibia, strongly support the Namibian people's independence struggle in all its forms, including armed struggle, and will continue to render moral, political and material support and assistance to SWAPO. We firmly support the countries of southern Africa in their struggle to defend their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. We resolutely support the people of South Africa in their just struggle against the system of *apartheid* and for basic human rights and racial equality, and we shall continue to provide whatever assistance lies within our power.

76. There may still be obstacles of all kinds in the process towards Namibian independence. We are convinced, however, that the Namibian people, strengthening their solidarity and persisting in their struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, will gain final victory and achieve the independence of Namibia.

77. Mr. ABDULLATIF (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At its thirty-ninth session the General Assembly is considering items and questions discussed at many previous sessions. What is really striking is that very few such problems have been solved effectively; others have become a permanent feature of the agenda of the General Assembly since the founding of the United Nations.

78. Yesterday [*77th meeting*], the General Assembly concluded its debate on agenda item 36, on the situation in the Middle East; today it is considering the question of Namibia; and in a few days, it will begin its consideration of the question of Palestine.

79. These three questions share a common factor: the existence of foreign occupation. As in Palestine and the Middle East, there is in Namibia an obnoxious foreign occupation. Another common factor in these three questions is the claim by the occupying authority to ownership of some or all of the territory under occupation and its attempts to annex it. In Palestine and the Middle East, Israel claims ownership of certain lands, as it colonizes and imposes its laws on others. The same thing is happening in Namibia; South Africa claims ownership of parts of that Territory. Yet another common factor in these questions is the existence of a racist policy which discriminates between population groups on the basis of race, religion or colour. Just as in Palestine, we see in southern Africa racial discrimination, which is condemned by the entire world. It is no wonder, therefore, that zionism has been declared a form of racism and South Africa's policy of *apartheid* has been characterized as another form of racism.

80. These are but three examples of the links connecting the three questions, because there is another common feature—namely, the intransigence and arrogance displayed by the forces of occupation. This feature is demonstrated in the Middle East and Palestine by Israel and in Namibia by South Africa. Both occupiers are faced with categorical rejection by the populations, which express that rejection by all possible means recognized by international law.

81. Oman is geographically near to parts of the African continent and, historically, has had excellent relations with that continent. This for us is a source of pride and honour, but above all it is the reason for our extreme interest in the affairs of that continent. The Sultanate of Oman shares the aspirations of the African continent and its hopes for just and lasting solutions to the problems that beset it. The Sultanate of Oman also fully shares the continent's grief and sorrow at Africa's plight resulting from deteriorating economic conditions, which derive mainly from a number of natural factors beyond Africa's control. The tragedy of the refugees and the famine afflicting millions of Africans are but two manifestations of the difficult situation facing the African continent.

82. My country reaffirms its solidarity with the peoples of the African continent and its hope that the African countries will occupy a better place in the constellation of nations. It is therefore no wonder that my country shows great interest in the question

of Namibia. We believe that the cause of Namibia is the cause of decolonization, which should be solved on the basis of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as related United Nations resolutions.

83. Any attempt to characterize the question of Namibia otherwise is but an attempt to distort the true nature of this cause.

84. On the basis of these principles, my delegation wishes to reaffirm the direct responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V). Moreover, we should like to reaffirm that the Namibian people have an inalienable right to self-determination and independence within a unified Namibia.

85. On the other hand, the occupation of Namibia by South Africa is an act of aggression under the definition contained in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX).

86. We consider the racist Government of South Africa fully responsible for the failure of all attempts made, whether by the United Nations or by others, including the failure of the talks held in 1984 at Lusaka and in Cape Verde regarding the question of Namibia.

87. The obstacles raised by South Africa during these negotiations are but a manoeuvre intended to perpetuate its régime, which is based on suppression, the occupation of Namibia and the exploitation of its natural resources.

88. My delegation firmly believes that Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which has been internationally recognized, should be fully implemented. It is to be regretted that this resolution has not yet been implemented.

89. Continued delay and procrastination can lead only to the prolongation of the suffering of the Namibian people and to more bloodshed and, moreover, are a danger to international peace and security not only in the African continent but in the world at large.

90. It is high time to put an end to the continued illegal occupation by South Africa of Namibia and to its aggression against the Namibian people and its exploitation of Namibia's natural resources.

91. The international community should assume its responsibilities clearly and unequivocally. Namibia must attain its full independence without any infringement of its territorial integrity, which includes Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. The international community should categorically reject the South African claims to ownership of that gulf and those islands, pursuant to the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly which have affirmed that Walvis Bay and the offshore islands are integral to Namibia and that any measure taken by South Africa to separate those areas from Namibia is null and void.

92. The international community has the direct responsibility of preserving the resources of Namibia and putting an end to the plundering of them. The resources of the Territory are the rightful property of the people of Namibia. The United Nations, which has assumed the responsibility of administering the Territory, is duty bound to preserve that right so that the Namibian people will be able to put these resources to good use after its independence is achieved.

93. The refusal of South Africa to comply with resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly or the Security Council or of other international organizations reminds us of the intransigence of Israel towards similar resolutions.

94. The international community is invited, today more than at any time in the past, to impose its will on racist South Africa by taking concrete and tangible measures. The international community should utilize all possible measures, including a comprehensive oil embargo and comprehensive compulsory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to compel South Africa to comply with the United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

95. Among the important measures that could be taken by the international community are those which could lead to weakening the military capabilities of the racist régime in South Africa, whether at the level of conventional or nuclear armaments. A feeling of might and power is the main motivating force behind the reckless behaviour of South Africa, which defies and disregards the will and resolutions of the international community. It is also the reason for the brutal oppression against the Namibian people. In addition, it is behind the actions taken to destabilize and commit aggression against the independent African States. The policies and practices of *apartheid* are but a reflection of this feeling of superiority and power. Is it strange in such circumstances that the people of Namibia are resisting this intransigence by all means and methods available to them?

96. The weakening of the military capabilities of South Africa cannot be brought about except by imposing an embargo on the shipment of conventional weaponry. Moreover, action should be taken to withhold the acquisition by South Africa of sophisticated technology in the nuclear field which might enable it to become a nuclear Power.

97. We are looking forward to the day when the people of Namibia will be able to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence. We hope that that day is near. We are confident that the roles the United Nations, through the United Nations Council for Namibia under the direction of Mr. Lusaka, and the Secretary-General can play, in accordance with the relevant resolutions, will enable the people of Namibia to achieve their aspirations to independence and freedom.

98. Mr. MINIKON (Liberia): As the United Nations approaches the fortieth anniversary of its founding, my delegation believes that a high point of its celebration and a timely tribute would be to have Namibia, represented by Namibians, rightly seated among the ranks of States Members of the United Nations. Regrettably, it would be unwise, in view of negative signals, to entertain any such false hopes or idle speculations that that will be the case. However, Liberia remains cautiously optimistic that good reasoning, moral courage, political will and justice will eventually prevail in the fulfilment of the inalienable rights of the people of Namibia.

99. In reflecting upon the accomplishments of the United Nations, my delegation would like to observe that, to date, the question of Namibia cannot be listed in the annals as having even come near to making meaningful progress towards self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namib-

ia. However, my delegation wishes to acknowledge the gains made by the United Nations in other directions concerning this matter, to which it will later address itself.

100. Liberia feels it both a duty and an obligation to participate in the debate on the question of Namibia, a question which has been a perennial item on the Assembly's agenda. In the past, the crescendo of hypocritical, contrived, contradictory and even self-defeating rhetoric has often exceeded meaningful and concerted action. This practice has led to the conclusion by some that such a situation could only encourage South Africa's intransigence towards United Nations decisions and resolutions, enabling the racist régime to continue further its illegal and colonial occupation of the Territory, an occupation terminated by the United Nations 18 years ago. Liberia will continue to condemn South Africa and its collaborators, who are known to come from all the various regions of the world.

101. Indeed, the United Nations has to its credit the implementation of historic resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly, which has resulted in a majority of countries with colonial conditions similar to those of Namibia joining the family of nations represented here, enabling them thus to mark in 1984 the hundredth anniversary of their own struggle against colonial occupation and the plundering of the natural resources of their countries. Many of these countries have gained their independence by violent means, some through eloquence and charisma and others through proud defiance. Their liberation struggle, whether violent or peaceful, required the mobilization of the whole nation.

102. Similarly, the liberation struggle of Namibia has enjoyed the support of the Namibian people, under the sole and authentic leadership of SWAPO. They have employed all the means I have just mentioned and, best of all, they have the support of international public opinion on their side as at no other time. But the Namibians have been confronted by set-backs and failures, inasmuch as South Africa has attempted to weaken their spirit of determination for that for which their forefathers so gallantly fought and for which so many of them continue to be oppressed and suppressed, that for which so many of them languish in gaols. However, nothing will deter them from achieving their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

103. What is the United Nations to make of the persistent colonial and illegal situation existing in Namibia? Have we unconsciously abandoned Namibia and its people and taken solace in the echoes of our own voices and the records of votes on resolutions relevant to this matter? Has the interpretation of the uniqueness of Namibia as a United Nations responsibility engendered a hard core of resistance to the applicability of the principles of self-determination, thereby ensuring the furtherance of the economic and strategic interests of some countries in southern Africa?

104. Namibia and its people are being shamelessly exploited and humiliated, and it is our view that the United Nations would not have found itself in such an awkward position had it moved swiftly and stood on firm ground, calling South Africa's bluff, in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), when the racist régime informed the Council that it had accepted that resolution in its final and definitive form. For its part, SWAPO accepted all the provisions of that resolution at that time, as it still does to this day. The time was ripe, the goal was definite and the target clear, but no definite action was taken.

105. Subsequently, there has been a divergence of interpretation by a few concerning some of the resolutions. The inescapable conclusion of many, to which my delegation adds its voice, is that South Africa will not yield to any decision which does not confirm its role as the undisputed regional power in southern Africa. This will force all its neighbours and other African Governments to reconsider their policies towards the Pretoria régime and, indeed, will win it international recognition.

106. The fortitude with which the Secretary-General has carried out his mandate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and his own personal efforts, will continue to be admired and praised. His report to the Security Council,[5] dated 19 May 1983, confirming that all the outstanding issues under resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved was thereafter challenged by South Africa, which reintroduced the subject of partiality by the United Nations towards SWAPO and insisted on extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

107. The Assembly will recall that, on 3 October 1984, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liberia, in his statement to the Assembly [*19th meeting*], clearly emphasized that it was difficult for Liberia to accept the linkage question, and this remains our position today.

108. The linkage question, however, has been emphatically rejected by the majority of the international community. My delegation is of the view that all southern African States have as much right as South Africa does to ensure their security interests. Therefore, we cannot acquiesce in any position that would compromise the sovereign decisions or jeopardize the security interests of those States for the benefit of South Africa.

109. But these extraneous issues should not be further permitted to grind to a halt, or even eclipse or overshadow, the heart of the Namibian question, which includes the illegal occupation and militarization of Namibia, the violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] the attempt to impose the inhuman policy of *apartheid*, the violation of human rights and the continued acts of aggression against neighbouring African States by South Africa. In this context, my delegation believes that countries having leverage on South Africa should endeavour to avert a situation which has been declared a threat to international peace and security.

110. My delegation believes that, in our endeavours to persuade the friends of South Africa to bring pressure to bear on the racist régime, we should at the same time speak out frankly and not hesitate to let them know about our attitude towards their alliance, which it is felt is undermining the United Nations position on Namibia.

111. At this juncture my delegation would like to make some observations concerning the policy of constructive engagement of one of the Western members of the Contact Group. Our perception of other aspects of this policy is not viewed as generally negative, but it poses some difficulties as applied to certain matters which are in direct conflict with the

objectives of the United Nations with regard to South Africa and Namibia.

112. I recognize, however, that convictions on this matter are held at such profound levels and raise such deep questions of the perception of this policy that it is doubtful how far it would be useful for my delegation to attempt a rational analysis of the merits of the respective positions or to attempt to persuade those that hold the view that every aspect of it is negative and that belonging to a particular regional group or organization means total opposition to this policy. We are not surprised at South Africa's capitalizing on the policy of constructive engagement to embarrass and blame its proponent for the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

113. What we had considered a positive initiative was the diplomatic trafficking which has been taking place during the course of the year involving SWAPO and some African and front-line States and which we had hoped would yield some fruitful results that would contribute to a process that would lead to the signing of a cease-fire and implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Unfortunately, closed issues have once again been reopened by South Africa, which has misused the opportunity on each occasion to make a mockery of the entire exercise for its own selfish gain. However, future initiatives, as such, should not be dismissed.

114. The people of Namibia have had to contend with difficulties unknown, perhaps, to any other colonial peoples, and with noble fortitude they are grappling manfully with them, to overcome them or die in their legitimate armed struggle. Liberia is certain that the Namibians will succeed and that any initiative designed to buy time for South Africa will fail.

115. My delegation would like to commend you, Sir, as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which Liberia is a member. Under your wise guidance and direction, the Council has been able to fulfil its mandate and to mobilize international public opinion on the question of Namibia. It would be a deserved tribute to you for Namibia to become independent during your leadership as President of the General Assembly and of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

116. My delegation reiterates that, in the event of the United Nations plan for Namibia not being immediately implemented, it would support urging the Security Council to meet again to shoulder its responsibilities fully, including taking urgent action to ensure implementation of its decisions and, if necessary, imposing sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. In the meantime, we also urge States, individually and collectively, to impose economic sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. Such an action would indicate unswerving support for the efforts towards self-determination, freedom and independence for the Namibians.

117. Finally, it would be remiss of my delegation not to express our appreciation to all those countries which have contributed consistently and without any reservation to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia, educational and relief assistance and fund-raising missions, as noted in a report of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia under the symbol A/AC.131/L.139. My delegation can only appeal to those with the means to do so to continue to contribute as generously, or more generously, to these activities. With the concern of all Member States for educated and trained Namibians to manage their affairs in the event of their independence and with a new set of commitments to the Territory's independence, it is possible for the Namibians to forgive and forget the injustices that have been inflicted upon them. We look forward to their joining our ranks in 1985, the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

118. Mr. SIEF (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): May I say, Sir, that my delegation considers your election to the presidency of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly to be a tribute and an honour to the steadfast people of Zambia on the front line of the racist régime that is occupying Namibia, as well as a tribute to you personally. At the same time, since you are also the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we see in your election an expression of the will and determination of the international community to help the liberation struggle in that Territory and to put an end to the long suffering of the Namibian people, who have been waging an heroic struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative. Therefore, we are confident that the coming period will be one of intensive work to help secure the independence of Namibia and enable it to occupy its official place as an independent State when we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

119. In spite of the great progress made by the United Nations and the national liberation movements since the adoption in 1960 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, thanks to the valiant struggle of the peoples of colonial territories, with the support and solidarity of the United Nations and anti-colonial forces throughout the world which cherish freedom, progress and peace, the Namibian people have not yet been able to enjoy their right to self-determination and national independence in accordance with decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and other international bodies. This is solely because of the intransigence and defiance of the racist Pretoria régime, which resorts to treachery and manoeuvres to bypass the resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly so as to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia.

120. The racist régime occupying Namibia does not confine itself to entrenching its illegal occupation of that Territory. In the very recent past it has reinforced its military presence there, set up tribal armies and imposed compulsory conscription on the Namibians. This feverish military activity is designed to suppress the national liberation movement of the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO and its companions. This activity has also transformed the territory of Namibia into a base from which to launch acts of sabotage and aggression against neighbouring States, especially Angola, parts of which are still occupied by the racist forces. These acts of sabotage and aggression against neighbouring States have become a source of great danger to stability and security in the region and in the world and are a violation of United Nations resolutions

prohibiting the use of colonial territories as bases for military activities against other States.

121. On the other hand, and notwithstanding Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the interests of racist South Africa, as well as those of the United States and other Western States, have dictated the continuance of their immoral exploitation of the natural and human resources of that Territory. A report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations[9] mentions that there are 90 such exploiting companies, 64 of them Western and American. The same report shows that the resources thus exploited and plundered cover all sectors, including strategic materials such as uranium and others necessary for the Western strategic-arms industries.

122. The information available to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples reveals that 60 per cent of the profits generated in Namibia is appropriated by group interests in racist South Africa and other foreign interests, especially Western and American, which transfer those profits to their countries of origin. Those economic activities in Namibia are completely alien to the basic interests of the Namibian people and do nothing to promote the development of the various economic sectors for Namibia's benefit after independence. Indeed, those activities constitute an obstacle to Namibia's independence.

123. The evidence contained in the relevant documentation submitted to this session and the debate in the Fourth Committee—at its 3rd, 5th and 19th meetings—on foreign economic and military activities in Namibia show the existence of collusion between South Africa and some Western countries, especially the United States and Israel, to sustain and encourage the Pretoria régime to perpetuate its occupation of that Territory.

124. The so-called policy of constructive engagement pursued by some States towards the racist régime of South Africa has indeed helped and encouraged that régime to continue its inhuman policy of *apartheid* and has strengthened its hold over Namibia.

125. The so-called policy of constructive engagement is nothing but a manoeuvre and an attempt at deception. It is one of the pretexts used to put obstacles in the way of the implementation of United Nations resolutions on the granting of independence to Namibia. The truth is simply that the interests of South Africa and its friends are the main reason for delaying the granting of independence to Namibia and for the pressures exerted against its population and neighbouring independent African States. The racist régime could not continue its defiance of the international community without the ongoing assistance of the United States and some other Western countries and Israel in the military, economic and diplomatic fields. It is that support which emboldens the racist South African régime to refuse to comply with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the granting of independence to Namibia. In recent years that support has extended directly and indirectly to the military and nuclear fields, including secret arms shipments as well. That can only lead to increasing that régime's arrogance, thus permitting its continued occupation of Namibia. It also encourages it in its acts of aggression and sabotage against neighbouring countries and peoples and the national liberation movements in southern Africa.

126. The United Nations bears special responsibility for securing independence immediately for the Namibian people and protecting its natural wealth and resources, as well as for ensuring full compensation for the plunder visited upon it. In this connection, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) calls for the independence of Namibia, and a comprehensive plan was formulated to implement that resolution. We hope that that resolution will be implemented without further obstacles or obstruction.

127. The cause of Namibia is one of national liberation and decolonization. There is therefore no room to view the problem from an ideological perspective or as part of the East-West confrontation. The United States bears special responsibility in respect of the granting of independence to that Territory in view of the fact that it is a permanent member of the Security Council.

128. Moreover, linking the granting of independence to Namibia to the withdrawal of internationalist Cuban forces from Angola is unacceptable. It is completely extraneous to the issue of Namibian independence. In addition, it is known that the People's Republic of Angola and Cuba have declared that the gradual withdrawal of the Cuban forces is possible, subject to the following conditions: first, withdrawal of the racist forces from Angola; secondly, implementation of the Security Council resolution granting independence to Namibia and the withdrawal of South African forces from Namibia; thirdly, an end to all acts or threats of aggression by South Africa, the United States and their allies; and, fourthly, an end to all assistance by the United States and the racist régime in South Africa to the counter-revolutionary forces in Angola.

129. The people of Namibia are victims of the racist colonial policy of the South African régime and its allied imperialist forces which provide that régime with military and economic assistance. They are the same forces which provide the racist Zionist régime with the wherewithal to oppress the Arab Palestinian people, brothers of the Namibian people suffering the same plight. The similarity between the two racist régimes of South Africa and Israel is today the prime reason for their close collaboration in all fields, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in the hope of continuing their oppression and perpetuating their domination over the African and Arab peoples.

130. Democratic Yemen, while calling for the prompt implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) regarding the immediate granting of independence to Namibia, wishes to reaffirm its unlimited support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative. Democratic Yemen also reaffirms its support for the African front-line States in confronting all imperialist and racist conspiracies designed to weaken their resolve to resist racism and occupation.

131. We call upon the United Nations and the international community to impose comprehensive, mandatory economic sanctions against the racist régime in South Africa and to ensure the total isolation of that inhuman régime.

132. The military and nuclear co-operation between the racist régime and some Western States, especially the United States and Israel, should be duly condemned, in view of its serious and dangerous implications for the struggle for the liquidation of imperialism and racism in southern Africa.

133. In conclusion, I would like to say that the questions of Namibia and Palestine are subjects of international concern. We are confident that the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, as well as the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people, will be crowned with success, thus removing the dangers of racism, which constitute today a source of threat to world peace and human justice and to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

134. Mr. SILWAL (Nepal): For more than 25 years the Namibian people have been under the domination of South Africa and its policies of *apartheid*. The problem of Namibia has been a concern of the United Nations since the beginning of the Organization. The United Nations, under the "principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples" contained in the Charter, has been working to free the Namibians from their helpless plight under the colonial system and to establish an independent Namibia.

135. In 1966, the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate and assumed the responsibility for administering South West Africa. This was followed by an historic decision by the International Court of Justice, in 1971,[3] which obliged States Members to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and refrain from assisting that régime. Yet, after so many years, South Africa blatantly continues to defy the United Nations and is illegally occupying Namibia under the *apartheid* system. The delegation of Nepal reiterates its full support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination, which, in our view, is just and legitimate and fully in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

136. In April 1960, in response to the need of the Namibian people, SWAPO was established. This movement was declared the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia by the General Assembly in 1976, in its resolution 31/146. Even in the conditions of the frequent arrests, repression and atrocities perpetrated against Namibia, SWAPO has been waging an heroic struggle against South Africa and the abhorrent system of *apartheid*. My delegation would like to commend the efforts of SWAPO in the brave struggle for independence and self-determination. We are convinced that, under the leadership of SWAPO and with the support of the African people and all peace-loving nations of the world, the Namibian people will overcome any obstacle put up by the South African régime and achieve the independence of Namibia.

137. The South African Government, in total disregard of the feeling of the international community, has resorted to increasing use of military force. A number of military, paramilitary and police units are deployed in Namibia to strengthen the illegal occupation and the *apartheid* system in South Africa, to suppress the popular resistance in Namibia and to destabilize neighbouring countries, especially Angola. Nepal firmly supports the African front-line States in their struggle to safeguard their national independence and territorial integrity and joins the international community in the demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola.

138. The Government of South Africa has for decades been exploiting the rich natural and human resources of Namibia for its own purposes. The exploitation of the Territory's natural resources is a violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and thus is of concern to all of us. In our view, the exploitation of Namibian resources stands as an obstacle to the independence of Namibia and its eventual economic independence.

139. Nepal has all along resolutely opposed and strongly condemned the South African racist colonial rule of Namibia and stood for resolving the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), so that the independence of Namibia may be achieved at an early date. Furthermore, we respect General Assembly resolution 38/36, the Paris Declaration on Namibia, and the report of the Committee of the Whole and the Programme of Action on Namibia adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.[7] My delegation commends the work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia and would like to pay a tribute to you, Mr. President, for the manner in which you have so wisely and ably guided the Council in the performance of its duty.

140. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, having assessed the situation in Namibia, expressed its dismay at the failure of the Security Council to discharge effectively its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Furthermore, it considered that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, if universally and effectively implemented, were the only available means to ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the United Nations.

141. My delegation, therefore, calls upon the Security Council to meet at the earliest possible date to consider further action on the implementation of its plan for Namibia's independence, thereby shouldering its primary responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We believe that enough time has elapsed since the adoption of this resolution and that it is high time for the Security Council to assume fully the central role in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and establish its own timeframe for such implementation.

142. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): It is with a feeling of deep frustration that we come here again today, 18 years after the United Nations revoked South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, to denounce the continuation of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa. It is incomprehensible that it has to this day been impossible to proceed to the application to the Namibian people of the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

143. The problem, which, along with that of Palestine, has been of great concern to the international community since the founding of the Organization and led to the adoption of the greatest number of resolutions and decisions by the United Nations is indeed the question of Namibia.

144. There is no need to recall here the various phases of this deplorable matter. We are all well aware of them, as the continuing debates in the United Nations indicate. They tell us that the attention of the world is still riveted to this problem and that the Organization remains firm in not allowing illegality to become the rule and strict respect for law the exception.

145. Since the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), the United Nations has, through arduous, patient and commendable efforts, with the contribution of several States which have direct influence on South Africa and the African front-line States, succeeded in producing a compromise plan to break the impasse which had been willed and maintained by South Africa. The plan for the peaceful and democratic accession to independence of the Territory of Namibia, endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), was accepted by all parties involved, including SWAPO—and here we must praise SWAPO's sense of responsibility and political courage. Only South Africa has been resorting to numerous subterfuges and delaying tactics to thwart the implementation of the plan and thus to delay the day when South Africa will have to leave Namibia—and one day, South Africa will have to leave Namibia.

146. In the six years that have elapsed since resolution 435 (1978), the fruit of those efforts, was adopted, no start has been made on its implementation. However, that resolution has given rise to hope for a negotiated and peaceful settlement. That hope, sustained with difficulty, has gradually been dispelled, given the blatant arrogance and renewed defiance of Pretoria.

147. From time to time, South Africa, to appease the impatience of almost all States and to supply excuses or alibis to some States Members of the United Nations, would have us believe, unsuccessfully, in its democratic mentality and its concern for the rights of the minority, the better to trample underfoot the rights of the majority.

148. Despite the unceasing efforts of States Members of the United Nations and of the organs directly concerned—the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and despite a considerable number of decisions and resolutions adopted on the issue, the Namibian people, to whom we should like here once again to express our admiration, have not yet been able to achieve their most legitimate aspirations to freedom, dignity and independence.

149. I should also like to express our great appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia which, under the vigilant guidance of Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, who is now President of the Assembly and to whom I pay tribute, has spared no effort to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it in 1967, consisting basically in promoting the necessary conditions for the speedy accession of the people of Namibia to independence, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

150. The courageous struggle waged by the Namibian people, under the enlightened leadership of SWAPO, has not yet overcome the criminal intransigence of the Pretoria régime in its espousal of the inhuman contradictions of *apartheid*, which has no other course than resort to brutal force and blind repression.

151. The Tunisian delegation takes this opportunity to reaffirm its full solidarity with the heroic struggle being waged by the Namibian people, under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, and to assure it of Tunisia's continued support until the advent of a free and united Namibia.

152. While the Secretary-General and SWAPO, supported by all of Africa, are sincerely seeking ways to promote the implementation of the United Nations plan, the South African Government, for its part, continues to flout the United Nations and openly to defy the international community.

153. Within Namibia, it has engaged in brutal acts of repression against the Namibian people in a desperate effort to stifle the people's fierce determination to regain their fundamental rights. There have been innumerable arbitrary arrests, house arrests and denials of fundamental human rights under the practice of *apartheid*.

154. At the same time, the Pretoria racist régime has pursued its crude constitutional and political manoeuvres aimed at imposing an internal settlement within the framework of the so-called Multi-Party Conference and in particular by setting up a council of state entrusted with producing a "Constitution".

155. Moreover, during the past few years, South Africa has continued to strengthen its military presence in Namibia, allowing it to carry out from that illegally occupied Territory repeated acts of aggression directed against independent African countries.

156. The racists of South Africa take advantage of their presence there to recruit and forcibly train Namibians to form tribal armies to fight against the liberation movements of southern Africa. In addition, they are setting up new military bases, in particular in the region near Namibia's northern frontier, from which they arbitrarily displace and expel civilian populations.

157. Confronted with this situation, we note with concern that some States, almost all of which are democratic and anti-racist, are continuing, strange as it seems, to collaborate with the Pretoria régime by supplying it with weapons and the means and technology to enable it to maintain its military supremacy in the region. Clearly, such co-operation is a serious violation of relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

158. Encouraged by the incredible, and inadmissible, benevolence of its allies, South Africa seeks to impose its own solution to the Namibian problem, without regard for the principles of international law that govern our civilized world or for the decisions of the international community.

159. It was the representative of South Africa who, on 23 October 1984, said before the Security Council that: "The South African Government rejects whatever decisions the Security Council may arrive at,

now and in the future, when it purports to address the domestic affairs of South Africa" and that "South Africa, as a regional Power in southern Africa, gives notice that it has no intention to capitulate."[8]

160. That statement is indeed instructive. It clearly states the refusal of the racist Government of Pretoria to accept a peaceful solution which would make possible Namibia's accession to independence.

161. Moreover, on the basis of that negative attitude regarding principles, Pretoria has been attempting to alter the spirit and the letter of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by putting forward pretexts irrelevant to the question of Namibia, thus blocking the decolonization process for that Territory. Backed by the support it has been able to obtain in certain capitals, Pretoria contrives at each stage of the negotiations to introduce new conditions. In this connection, we reiterate that any attempt to introduce any element irrelevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is unacceptable.

162. The Contact Group, which shouldered a major responsibility in the preparation and adoption of the settlement plan, must demonstrate real political will and exert greater pressure on the South African Government to comply with the provisions of resolution 435 (1978), the sole valid framework within which a solution in keeping with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people may be found.

163. Furthermore, one of the members of the Contact Group, a permanent member of the Security Council, has itself pointed out the inadequacy of the action taken by that group. It has learned a lesson and at the same time shown us what little hope we can place in that group, unless, in a final push, it seriously sets about its task of bringing all its weight to bear on the side of law and justice. It would in that way have kept its promises to the Namibian people, to Africa and to the international community.

164. The United Nations, to whose principles we are firmly dedicated, must change its approach and compel South Africa to respect its resolutions, including resolution 435 (1978), which, as we have said, remains the sole valid basis for a negotiated settlement.

165. We believe that, in the interest of international peace and security, the Security Council should not hesitate, given Pretoria's arrogance, to take effective measures, in accordance with the relevant Articles of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to protect the territorial integrity of Namibia and the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

166. By making use of the possibilities offered by Chapter VII of the Charter, it is still possible to spare the peoples of southern Africa the risks of a serious confrontation. Moreover, those possibilities for action should not be subject to the political will of certain Powers which, particularly in the Security Council, have paralysed the United Nations and made its action ineffective.

167. We venture to hope that wisdom and realism will prevail and that by pooling our efforts we shall be able to ensure that long-term interests will take precedence over the short-term interests that rule the choices of some, and to compel Pretoria to face the single, clear reality and withdraw from Namibia in accordance with the United Nations settlement plan.

168. Efforts undertaken by all with sincerity and faith in the force of law and the obligations of the United Nations can ensure that Namibia emerges from the long night of colonialism and at our next session becomes a full Member of the Organization and takes on all its international responsibilities as a free, sovereign and independent State.

169. Then, finally, we shall have fulfilled our commitment in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

170. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): This year is the one-hundredth year of the colonial occupation of Namibia. It also marks the centenary of the systematic brutal treatment and suppression of Namibia's human resources and the heartless exploitation of its natural resources. The Assembly knows only too well the tragic and pathetic plight of the Namibian people. There is, therefore, no need for me to rehearse the several resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council demanding the withdrawal of the racist régime of South Africa from Namibia. Nor is it necessary for me to bore the Assembly with details of the efforts that have been made—without any success, I might say—to secure the withdrawal of the racist régime from Namibia. All this is too well known to require any further elaboration.

171. My delegation remains seriously concerned about the situation in Namibia in particular and, indeed, in southern Africa in general. It is a matter for deep regret that the danger posed to international peace and security by the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist South African régime is not recognized by those Powers that wilfully and in an arrogant manner continue openly to encourage the Pretoria régime to persist in its open defiance of the Organization.

172. The whole world has witnessed the bizarre spectacle of the past couple of weeks, in which the racist régime has launched a vicious, unprovoked and barbaric attack against innocent, defenceless blacks whose only crime is that they dare to speak out against *apartheid*, a system which, as we all know, dehumanizes them and renders them stateless in their own country.

173. Standing Committee II of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in its report on the activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia,[9] noted that the plunder of the natural and human resources of Namibia by South African and other foreign economic interests continues unabated and in contravention of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted in 1974. That report further noted that the illegal occupation of Namibia by *apartheid* South Africa has resulted in a colonial economy characterized by the siphoning off of the Territory's extensive natural resources and its captive labour force by transnational corporations based in South Africa, Western Europe and North America.

174. Here lies the crux of the problem. While South Africa ignores the international community, the connivance of its Western allies makes it safe for their transnational corporations to exploit Namibia. We reject as hypocritical and tendentious the argument that the activities of these Western transnational corporations contribute in any meaningful way to the lives of the Namibian people.

175. The continual use of the veto by South Africa's allies in the Security Council, making United Nations actions and proposals impotent, must be

viewed against this background. We have witnessed certain Member States, which in February 1981 condemned South Africa for its duplicity and disruptive practices during the Geneva pre-implementation talks, later turn round and veto draft resolutions in the Security Council that urge the imposition of sanctions against the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria. This they have done in order to save the régime from economic, cultural and political isolation by the world community.

176. There have been paradoxes in connection with the Namibian question and, indeed, southern African problems generally. It has recently been shamelessly argued that *apartheid* is not one of the many violations of human rights. Such views need no response. They are at best to be taken as a convoluted rationalization of evil by a new breed of leaders of men and nations which have made it possible for otherwise rational human beings in this so-called civilized world to agree to coexist with *apartheid* South Africa. This has been the thrust of the so-called policy of constructive engagement, a policy that has enabled exponents of democratic principles in the world to help in nipping off the buds of freedom in Namibia, a policy that has encouraged the racist Pretoria régime in its defiance of the United Nations and strengthened racist South Africa in its continued massive militarization of Namibia. This policy has been defended as an instrument in getting the *apartheid* régime to evolve towards peaceful change.

177. We reject these pretentious premises, which are nothing but a smoke-screen to hide what is essentially an amoral, materialistic and racially biased policy. For, indeed, the constructive engagement policy has shown no results since its inception. Namibia is no closer to independence than it was four years ago, and the South African racists have not softened in their abhorrent and inhuman system of *apartheid*.

178. We hesitate to labour the point, but we reiterate our call to the United States—a country with which Nigeria, and, indeed, most of Africa, enjoys warm and cordial relations—to reconsider this policy of constructive engagement. We have no doubt that the United States Government is committed to democracy and freedom. We plead that pressure be brought to bear on *apartheid* South Africa to apply this same principle to the 23 million blacks who have been savagely dehumanized in their own country and to encourage South Africa to bow to the decisions of the United Nations and set Namibia free. The United States has more than enough leverage in this regard and, indeed, could make all the difference.

179. On behalf of my delegation, I dare to ask this question of the United States: can we hope to have Namibia celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations as an independent State? I hope it will answer in the affirmative, because the issue of Namibia's independence is one on which the whole of Africa is united, and no amount of pressure, such as the arm-twisting tactics that have been brought to bear on us in recent days, will make us change.

180. Nigeria remains committed to the solution of the problem of *apartheid* in South Africa and to independence for Namibia. The achievement of the independence of a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay, continues to remain a cardinal objective of our foreign policy and we shall not relax in our efforts until total victory is won. We reaffirm our unflinching support for SWAPO and our call for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, as endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without further delay and without modification, amplification or any pre-conditions. Resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted after a rigorous and protracted process of negotiations during which SWAPO was prevailed upon to make countless concessions, remains today, six years after its adoption, unimplemented. But we reaffirm our position that this resolution is the only acceptable basis for the solution of the Namibian question.

181. We are and shall ever remain convinced that, no matter how long it takes, the Namibian people will eventually emerge victorious over the colonialist *apartheid* forces of occupation. We maintain also that Namibia remains a direct and unique responsibility of the United Nations until the achievement of genuine independence.

182. Finally, let me take this opportunity to convey to you, Sir, my sincere and deep appreciation of the services you have continued to render to the United Nations Council for Namibia in your capacity as its President. I have no doubt that under your continued able leadership the Council will continue its vigorous efforts in the interests of the Namibian people and to ensure the attainment of their objective.

183. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community.

184. Namibia has been an acknowledged international responsibility for more than 60 years and an issue before the United Nations virtually since the inception of the Organization. It is a particular responsibility and concern of the United Nations and is one of the most serious problems which the Organization has faced.

185. The Ten have consistently reiterated the view that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end. The United Nations settlement plan, endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) and accepted by both the Government of South Africa and SWAPO, provides for the peaceful transition of Namibia to internationally recognized independence. It alone embodies a universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed by the United Nations to be free and fair. The Ten firmly believe, therefore, that the people of Namibia must be permitted to determine their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in accordance with that settlement plan. The Ten do not accept that the settlement plan should be delayed or set aside for extraneous reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with resolution 435 (1978).

186. Strenuous efforts have been made over the years by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the front-line States, Nigeria, SWAPO, the Organization of African Unity and the Contact Group aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Ten have consistently supported these efforts. In this context, the Ten wish to confirm that they will continue to support the contacts of the Secretary-General with the parties concerned aimed at achieving a settlement within the framework of resolution

435 (1978) and in accordance with resolution 539 (1983).

187. The Ten recognize the significance of recent developments in southern Africa. They noted with satisfaction the agreement reached between Angola and South Africa on 16 February 1984 at Lusaka on the strengthening and monitoring of the military disengagement in southern Angola. They commend the efforts of all parties concerned to bring about increased security and stability in the region and express the hope that these developments will contribute to a climate of mutual confidence which will facilitate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Ten deeply regret, however, that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of resolution 385 (1976) continues and that hopes for a settlement remain as yet unfulfilled.

188. The Ten strongly condemn all acts of violence and intimidation committed in Namibia. These acts, including the practice of arbitrary arrests and detentions without trial, cause great suffering to the local population. The recent imposition by South Africa of military conscription of all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve in its army occupying Namibia is of profound concern to the Ten and they strongly deplore it.

189. There is deep international concern about the delay in securing Namibian independence. Implementation of the United Nations settlement plan is an urgent requirement. Six years have now passed since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) endorsing the plan. The Ten reiterate their rejection of any dilatory tactics employed by South Africa to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to impose an internal settlement on its people. The Ten will continue to work for and support all efforts aimed at the urgent implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

190. The European Community and its member States will also continue their aid to the Namibian people, particularly through their support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia, and they reaffirm their readiness to assist in the development of a free and independent Namibia.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16237.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[3] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

[4] *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vol. XVII (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.V.3), document A/CONF.62/122.

[5] *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1983*, document S/15776.

[6] *Policies and Practices of Transnational Corporations regarding Their Activities in South Africa and Namibia* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.II.A.5).

[7] *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), part three.

[8] *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year*, 2560th meeting.

[9] See A/AC.131/115.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

80th
PLENARY MEETING
Friday, 30 November 1984,
at 11 a.m.
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. CÉSAR (Czechoslovakia): The question of Namibia has ranked for many years among the crucial items on the agenda of the General Assembly, not only as the most flagrant example of persisting colonialism, but also as a source of a serious threat to peace and security in southern Africa that has a negative impact on the overall international situation.

2. The General Assembly is considering this question, at its thirty-ninth session, a full century after the infamous Berlin Conference. The past 100 years have been for Namibia a period of colonial subjugation and imperialist exploitation, but at the same time also a period of heroic struggle by the Namibians against the colonialists and occupiers for self-determination and the free development of their homeland. This endeavour has rightly received the support of the United Nations and of the entire progressive-minded international public. There is no doubt that it will be crowned by recognition of the rights and fulfilment of the desires and aims of the Namibian people, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and international law, the ideal of decolonization and the moral postulates of our time.

3. Yet, so far, the justified demands of the Namibian people have been encountering opposition on the part of the inheritors of the ideas of those who 100 years ago carried out the colonial division of Africa. The imperialist successors to the participants in the Berlin Conference ignore the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Namibians. The Pretoria régime has been using every possible means to prolong its illegal occupation of Namibian territory, ignoring the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and preventing Namibia's accession to independence, thus totally disregarding the decisions adopted by the United Nations to that end. It has been desperately striving to carry out a neo-colonialist solution by means of a so-called internal settlement, transferring to Namibia at the same time the inhuman practices of *apartheid* and, through attacks from Namibian territory, maintaining and escalating tensions in the south of the African continent.

4. The aim of the colonial policy of South Africa towards Namibia is to prolong and perpetuate the plundering of the rich Namibian mineral and natural resources, and the exploitation of the work and skills of the Namibians by South African and Western monopolies, primarily transnational corporations. A number of documents of the United Nations and other sources clearly show that the colonial enslavement of Namibia brings immense profits to South African, United States and other transnational corporations. Another purpose of the continued occupation of Namibia is to maintain there a spring-board for launching acts of aggression and subversion against revolutionary African States and exerting military influence on developments in the whole region in the interest of world imperialism. These aims are achieved primarily through the militarization of Namibia. Pretoria, as is well known, deploys on Namibian territory more than 100,000 soldiers and mercenaries. There is one soldier of the occupying forces for every 12 Namibian nationals. Moreover, the occupation authorities have ordered forced conscription of Namibians for the repression and murder of their brothers. All this creates the prerequisite conditions for the consistent oppression of the Namibians by military means, as well as through the police and the judicial system, and is documented by reports on the murder, imprisonment and deportation of those who struggle for the rights of the Namibian people.

5. In addition to its repressive policies inside Namibia, Pretoria has been putting obstacles in the way of efforts by the international community to solve the Namibian question and blocking implementation of the relevant decisions of the United Nations. In the interest of United States strategy in southern Africa, it has made the totally unjustifiable demand that Namibia's independence be linked to the departure of Cuban internationalist troops from Angola.

6. The efforts of Pretoria to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia as long as possible and to impose neo-colonial models on that country's further development are not isolated. They cannot be viewed separately from the support and co-operation provided to Pretoria by a number of Western States, primarily the United States and Israel, which are essential conditions for the Pretoria régime to maintain its unlawful positions. That support and co-operation are motivated by the political, economic and global strategic interests of those States. In

defiance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, their monopolies participate with those of South Africa in plundering the natural resources of Namibia and exploiting the labour of its population, using the continued occupation of Namibia to pursue their strategic and hegemonist aims on the African continent. Those States have developed broad economic co-operation with South Africa. It has been proved, as set out in United Nations documents, that they violate the embargo declared by the United Nations against the supply of arms to South Africa and promote the continuous growth of the military potential of the racist régime. They have assisted Pretoria in building up a military and nuclear potential, making it possible for that régime to produce nuclear weapons, which are directed primarily against African States. They have given South Africa all kinds of military and political support. The recent visit by Prime Minister Botha to several Western European countries and the repeated action against the adoption of measures as set forth in Chapter VII of the Charter to ensure implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations constitute illustrations of these facts. The Power that violates international law and jeopardizes security and peace in southern Africa is thus backed by forces which are striving to destabilize the world situation, escalating the arms race and, through their conduct, increasing the danger of nuclear conflict.

7. No just and lasting solution of the Namibian question and of the whole situation in southern Africa can be achieved without the immediate and unconditional exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and the consistent elimination of all remnants of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism in that region. The blame for the failure of the long-standing efforts to solve the Namibian question undeniably rests with the policy of the South African Government and the support and assistance granted to that Government by the United States and other imperialist countries.

8. The way to terminate the sufferings of the Namibian people and assure their freedom and independence is delineated quite precisely in the decisions of the United Nations and primarily in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 539 (1983). It is imperative to put those decisions into practice without delay and to strengthen the role of the United Nations in their implementation. It is necessary to reject now, as before, all attempts to link the decolonization of Namibia to any irrelevant questions or other demands. Sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter must be applied so as to compel the Pretoria régime to meet the legitimate requirements of the Namibian people, the United Nations and the international community.

9. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully supports all effective measures to ensure the immediate and unconditional termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence on the basis of the maintenance of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We commend and welcome the negotiations and conclusions of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has consistently pursued, under your wise and devoted leadership, Mr. President, the achievement of those goals.

10. We give our firm and comprehensive support to the courageous struggle of the Namibian people, headed by the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We believe that the task of putting a stop to the crimes committed against the Namibians and securing true independence for their country is an extraordinarily important one, the fulfilment of which brooks no delay.

11. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): In 1984 we have witnessed a series of events that generate both hope and frustration in reference to the Namibian question. It is undeniable that conversations relating to the relaxation of tensions in southern Africa can serve the purpose of paving the way to free elections in Namibia. That is why we have followed with particular interest the talks between South Africa and some of the front-line States—in particular Angola—which we believe could play an important role in the establishment of adequate conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Brazil holds that the outcome of those negotiations cannot be improperly used by Pretoria to justify further delays in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

12. The final test for assessing the good faith involved in recent meetings relating to the cessation of hostilities in southern Africa certainly depends on Pretoria, which, however, has constantly refused to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

13. During the general debate this year, we heard numerous statements in favour of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and renewed expressions of support for the Namibian people and their legitimate representative, SWAPO. It is indeed important to keep in mind that the independence of Namibia is still one of the unattained common objectives of the United Nations and that, therefore, any further postponement of final measures to implement self-determination in the Territory would be unacceptable.

14. You, Mr. President, stated, in your address on 18 September, that "the agony and travail of the Namibian people continue" and that: "It is essential that we co-operate in redoubling our efforts to expedite the implementation of the United Nations plan with a view to enabling the people of Namibia to enjoy the freedom and independence which they so much deserve" [*1st meeting, para. 74*]. Your opinion, Sir, is shared by the Brazilian Government, which desires to maintain its support for the Namibian people and their representatives.

15. In this context, let me just mention the seminar for leaders of SWAPO, organized by the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, on the Brazilian experience in dealing with transnational corporations, which our country had the honour to host in Rio de Janeiro last September. We would also like at this stage to pay a tribute to those organizations which were involved in meetings devoted to this question.

16. On all occasions the international community has made it clear that, beyond the question of their inalienable right to independence, the Namibian people, which are under illegal South African occupation, are also entitled to moral and material support.

We must always remember in this connection that behind diplomatic failures lies the frustration of those people.

17. Brazil has constantly encouraged the Secretary-General in his task of ensuring conditions leading to the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision. The United Nations Council for Namibia also makes efforts to pool contributions in support of SWAPO and the people it represents. In 1984, the Council held consultations with some European countries, the European Parliament and the Commission of the European Communities. From the report of the Council [*A/39/24*] we are pleased to note, on the one hand, that there is growing understanding of the aspirations of the Namibian people. On the other hand, however, we regret that in some cases it is still difficult to visualize a common and strong standpoint on the task of assuring peaceful independence for Namibia.

18. We support the views of the United Nations Council for Namibia as to the importance of keeping in close contact with those States that can exert a positive influence as far as Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is concerned. In this connection, we express again our belief that no extraneous interests should hamper the early attainment of independence by the people of that Territory, in accordance with that resolution which we consider to be fully valid.

19. One aspect that the Brazilian delegation would like to highlight is reflected in a working paper of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We agree with the opinion expressed therein that: "The question of Namibia has always been and remains a decolonization issue and must be . . . resolved in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant United Nations resolutions".[2] We also adhere to the view that any attempt to portray the Namibian question as part of an East-West confrontation is against the will of the international community, as reflected in the position adopted by the United Nations, and could only have the effect of further delaying the independence of Namibia.

20. We feel that the time has come to voice a strong message against the dilatory manoeuvres of the South African Government, upon which we place the obligation of responding to the signs of flexibility already shown by other interested parties to this question. Failure to achieve soon independence in Namibia would be a shadow, among others, on the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

21. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): It is now 100 years since the colonial occupation and exploitation of Namibia started with the invasion by imperialist German colonial troops. It is well known that in 1918, after the First World War, South Africa took over the role of the direct colonial oppressor of what was then South West Africa. To this day, the régime, in presumptuous and so far unpunished defiance of the United Nations, has not been willing to give up the illegal occupation of the Territory and to grant the Namibian people its independence. The chapter of colonial history has not yet been completed for that country. Namibia has become a symbol: a symbol of the most inhumane form of imperialist power politics, but also a symbol of the unbroken will of an oppressed people to win its independence.

22. It is completely justifiable for the question of Namibia to be given the highest attention here in plenary meeting, as well as in other organs of the General Assembly. Many useful initiatives have been taken by the United Nations, all aimed at terminating an intolerable state of affairs—namely, the colonial subjugation of the Namibian people, which has lasted for a whole century. One such activity recently, organized by the United Nations Council for Namibia, was the Symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle by the Namibian People against Colonialism—a struggle that has lasted as long as the occupation itself—which was held in New York from 31 October to 2 November. The "Appeal for Action", contained in the document adopted at the concluding meeting of the Symposium,[3] points clearly to the obstacles blocking the granting of independence to that country. At the same time, it shows where action must be directed. A pertinent plan lays emphasis on the full responsibility of the United Nations for the solution of the problem and the need to reject all attempts by the United States and South Africa to bypass the Organization. The participants in the Symposium called for strict measures to be taken by the Security Council against Pretoria. The final document also points to ways of strengthening the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The German Democratic Republic considers this Symposium to be a highlight of the activities of the Council and supports without any reservations the positions and recommendations contained in the document adopted.

23. The question of why the racist régime in Pretoria is able to disregard all resolutions of the United Nations concerning the solution of the question of Namibia has often been answered. Left to its own devices, South Africa would long since have been forced to give up the illegal occupation, despite its economic and military strength, and the representative of an independent Namibia would occupy his legitimate seat among the States Members of the United Nations. If that is not yet the case, it is only because strong global-strategic and economic interests have made the imperialists in the United States and other Western States the declared friends of the régime in Pretoria. Verbal condemnation of South Africa's policy cannot obscure that fact.

24. My delegation is very concerned about the intention of imperialist circles to incorporate Pretoria's policy, which is aimed at regional hegemony, in their global policy of confrontation and arms build-up. In this way, Namibia has a key role. Its territory is still the starting-point for South African acts of aggression, destabilization and State terrorism against neighbouring States. This makes the solution of the problem all the more urgent, since the matter is a question not only of decolonization but also of the need to eliminate once and for all a dangerous source of threat to peace and security, and not in that region alone. It is in this perspective that my delegation values the proposals recently made by the People's Republic of Angola [*A/39/688*]. They represent a constructive expression of the will of the Angolan Government to reach a speedy and just solution of the question of Namibia on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions, and to achieve lasting peace in the region.

25. We know that the implementation of the proposals requires that all States Members of the United Nations do their utmost. Now, as before, we are facing the fact that Pretoria and its closest allies attach pre-conditions to the granting of independence to Namibia which have nothing at all to do with the problem.

26. One of these pre-conditions is the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola. That linkage, which represents flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, must be regarded as part of the racists' policy of destabilization, as another form of the attacks carried out for so many years against social progress in the region. Its purpose is to gain unconditional acceptance for the interests of imperialism and to destroy the national liberation movements.

27. I have already pointed to the economic factor, which is also one of the causes retarding a just solution for Namibia. The immense treasures of that country constitute a profitable source of raw materials for imperialism. The human and natural resources of Namibia are unscrupulously exploited by South African capital, and the way is opened to Western companies to pillage Namibia's mineral resources. As is clearly illustrated in a report of the United Nations Council for Namibia of 4 April 1983,[4] such corporations have their headquarters, above all, in the United States, Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western States. All this is contrary to the resolutions and decisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, is systematically bypassed. Unimpressed by the Decree, and with the connivance of the Governments of their countries of origin, the transnational corporations are intensifying the pillage of Namibia.

28. How, therefore, could one be astonished at the comprehensive aid that the Pretoria régime is receiving from the United States, other Western States and Israel? The collaboration in the military and nuclear fields, which, despite Security Council resolution 418 (1977), continues to grow, arouses particular concern.

29. It is in these hostile external conditions that the front-line States are waging a persistent struggle to strengthen their independence and to establish peace and security in the region. The German Democratic Republic supports all measures by the African States designed to secure the peaceful development of that region, their independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty, and further to strengthen the co-operation of States and national liberation movements.

30. My country advocates that Namibia should immediately be granted independence in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions—including Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—in their entirety and with observance of the territorial integrity of the country. Resolution 435 (1978) allows for no "ifs" or "buts" and no linkage whatsoever.

31. It is now imperative that the United Nations—in particular, the Security Council—fully shoulder its responsibility in accordance with the will of the Member States. Hence, there is a great need for the Security Council to decide to impose effective sanctions against South Africa; to take measures to implement resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and reject all delaying tactics; to tighten the arms embargo against Pretoria; and to stop the manoeuvres of the racists to impose a so-called internal settlement.

32. The solidarity of the German Democratic Republic with the just struggle waged by the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO—its internationally recognized, sole and legitimate representative—contributes towards the elimination of a dangerous hotbed of tensions and is therefore in the interest of international peace and security. The Head of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, reaffirmed the principled position of my country regarding this question only a few days ago, when he emphasized that:

> "Our support and helpful solidarity will continue to be extended to the States, peoples and forces which are exposed to imperialist aggression and degrading racism. We resolutely condemn the imperialist policy of kindling existing conflicts and of creating new tensions and crises with a view to maintaining and restoring imperialist influence. This applies to the Near and Middle East as well as to the situation in Africa and Latin America."

33. Thanks to the solidarity of its people, the German Democratic Republic was able, between 1975 and 1983, to provide about $200 million to the peoples and liberation movements in southern Africa. Assistance to the victims of the South African policy of aggression and oppression, to the African front-line States and to SWAPO and the African National Congress of South Africa amounted to 40 million marks in 1983. We shall continue this assistance as long as it is required.

34. My country views the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*], which we shall commemorate next year, as an opportunity to make increased efforts, including efforts within the framework of the United Nations, to see the Namibian people granted their right to self-determination and independence in the near future. The United Nations has the strength and the ability to meet its responsibility towards Namibia. Feelings of disappointment about the failure of past efforts are not helpful, nor is a pretended or calculated optimism. What is needed is the firm will jointly to do everything which serves the realization of the noble objective—the liberation of Namibia.

35. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): It is now 18 years since the international community laid upon the United Nations the responsibility for Namibia's future, the unique and very special responsibility for leading an illegally occupied country to freedom, securing a peaceful transfer of power to its people and finally establishing it in its rightful place as a sovereign and independent State.

36. Furthermore, six years have passed since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), providing for a peaceful transition to majority rule in Namibia through free and fair elections under the auspices of the United Nations. Austria has, from the outset, fully supported the United Nations plan for Namibia, which was endorsed by that resolution. We regard the plan as the most promising way to end South Africa's illegal occupation of the territory and thus to enable the Namibian people fully to exercise their right to self-determination and independence

and to elect their own Government, free from outside interference or coercion.

37. In the view of the Austrian Government, any political settlement which aims at stability and durability has to rest on the broadest possible base, including all the parties concerned. The United Nations plan for Namibia meets those requirements.

38. Since the adoption of the plan, intensive negotiations, with the constructive participation of SWAPO, have led to agreement on practically all modalities of carrying out the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). But, in spite of this, the actual beginning of the implementation process has been delayed again and again.

39. The reason for this frustrating state of affairs is well known: it is South Africa's refusal to comply with the spirit and letter of the United Nations plan and its persistent attempts to gain time by introducing additional conditions. Austria has consistently opposed this policy. Extraneous issues must not be used as a pretext to obstruct the carrying out of the United Nations plan.

40. We support the discussion of all security-related questions of the region between the interested Governments and welcome any equitable security arrangements which could prevent further violence and reduce tensions. In this context, we follow with great interest the ongoing discussions between Angola and South Africa. There can be no doubt, however, that only the actual implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia will give a clear indication of the commitment of all sides to peaceful change and stability in the region.

41. It is imperative that South Africa end its delaying tactics and that it permit the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). A continued deadlock would increase the impatience of those who for so long have been deprived of their right to self-determination and independence and would trigger an escalation of violence and bloodshed. It would result in a further destabilization of the area and would reduce the chances of a peaceful settlement.

42. But urgency is called for, not only with regard to questions of justice and security, but also with respect to economic and social considerations. The continued illegal occupation, together with the unrest in much of the Territory, constitutes a heavy weight on the economy of Namibia. Only its accession to independence would permit that country to achieve genuine, unobstructed economic and social development. In the meantime, the Namibian people must be able to rely on the assistance of the international community. The activities of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and of the United Nations Institute for Namibia are, in our view, particularly important for the future development of an independent Namibia. Both programmes have received and will continue to receive the financial support of the Austrian Government.

43. We must not overlook the regional implications of the question of Namibia. The South African occupation of that Territory is a permanent source of tension and instability for the entire region of southern Africa. On the other hand, the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and the accession of Namibia to independence would greatly alleviate the prevailing tension and help to establish an atmosphere of mutually fruitful co-operation among the countries of southern Africa.

44. The fate of Namibia is indeed the key to a peaceful future for the southern African region, where the situation continues to be highly unstable. At stake are not only the freedom and the future of the Namibian people, but also fundamental values and principles upon which the United Nations is based. Therefore, we call upon all parties concerned to shoulder their responsibilities, to break the deadlock and to begin the implementation of the United Nations plan without further delay.

45. Mr. RÁCZ (Hungary): The year 1984 marks 100 years of colonial occupation of Namibia. One hundred years ago, the infamous Berlin Conference completed the division of Africa among the colonial Powers of the time. Last year, conferences, seminars and symposiums were organized by the United Nations Council for Namibia and other organizations, including non-governmental organizations, to draw the attention of world public opinion to the heroic struggle waged by the Namibian people during the past 100 years against colonial oppression.

46. The International Non-Governmental Organization Conference for the Independence of Namibia and the Eradication of *Apartheid,* held at Geneva from 2 to 5 July 1984, declared:

> "In line with the slogan of 'One hundred years—no more', the Conference calls upon all progressive and peace-loving Governments, organizations and individuals to redouble their efforts in support of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, in their just struggle for national liberation."

47. A thorough analysis of the situation in Namibia was undertaken by the Symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle by the Namibian People against Colonialism, organized by the United Nations Council for Namibia in New York from 31 October to 2 November 1984. The Symposium identified four major obstacles in the path of Namibia's independence: first, South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia; secondly, the support South Africa receives from certain Western and other countries, in particular the United States; thirdly, the particularly negative role of the United States, with its policy of "constructive engagement" and its insistence on the notorious linkage of Namibia's independence with irrelevant and extraneous issues; and fourthly, the presence of transnational corporations in Namibia and their plunder and exploitation of Namibia's natural and human resources.

48. My delegation shares the views expressed in the "Appeal for Action" adopted by the Symposium. We also support the plan of action which was unanimously agreed upon by the participants.

49. One of the most urgent tasks is the assumption by the United Nations of full responsibility over Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia is the legal Administering Authority of the Territory and should carry out all tasks delegated to it by the United Nations, with the participation of all the countries concerned in the solution of the problem and of SWAPO.

50. The preparation of the people of Namibia for independence is a major task. The Council has been playing a very important role in this important process and has achieved considerable results.

51. The preservation of the Territory's natural resources for an independent Namibia is also the responsibility of the United Nations. Legal action should be taken against corporations which continue to plunder the natural resources of the Territory in violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.[1]

52. In the course of the annual discussions of the question of Namibia, we have become more and more confident that the moment of Namibia's independence is approaching. We firmly believe that this is not unfounded optimism, but confidence based on reality and confirmed by facts. The most important fact is that the people of Namibia are ready for independence and are determined to achieve it.

53. The leading force in the struggle for independence, SWAPO, is a strong, well-organized and disciplined organization which enjoys the support of the overwhelming majority of the international community. We believe that that support should be intensified in political, moral and material terms alike.

54. Another important fact is that attempts made by South Africa and its supporters to impose an "internal solution"—more specifically, a neo-colonial régime—on the Namibian people, with the help of the so-called Multi-Party Conference, have proved to be a complete failure.

55. The growing international pressure on the racist régime of South Africa is also a fact of great importance. Last year's international campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa was an example of such pressure. We propose the continuation of that campaign.

56. I take this opportunity to emphasize the urgent need for independence for Namibia. Any attempt to link this issue to any other irrelevant, extraneous issues is inadmissible and must be firmly rejected.

57. In order to achieve Namibia's early independence the international community should increase the pressure on the racist régime. It is time for the Security Council to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions on South Africa if it does not comply with the resolutions of the United Nations without further delay.

58. In conclusion, I should like to express the solidarity and full support of the people and Government of the Hungarian People's Republic for the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative.

59. Mr. MUSTAFA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again the Assembly is debating the question of Namibia, at a time when conditions in the southern part of Africa continue to become increasingly tense. The wide participation of the delegations of Member States in this debate reflects clearly the continuing and increasing attention given by the international community to the question of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and its disregard of the will of the international community and the aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom, independence and sovereignty over their territory.

60. One hundred years have elapsed since Namibia was occupied, and for all that time the struggling people of the Territory have been denied their right to self-determination and independence. The efforts of the international community to solve this problem have not proved successful, and this brings into serious question the ability of the United Nations to accelerate the independence of the Territory and to bring about a peaceful settlement, as provided for in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which must be the basis of any solution of the question of Namibia. The racist régime of South Africa continues to disregard the resolutions of the United Nations.

61. The racist régime of South Africa does not confine itself to tightening its colonial grip on the Namibian people, but even carries out its odious policy of *apartheid* in Namibia, imprisoning thousands and killing hundreds of the struggling people of Namibia. Furthermore, its aggressive policies go beyond the boundaries of Namibia, as evidenced by its continued acts of aggression against African States, which are an extension of the continuing violence and terrorism pursued by that régime, in line with the policies of the Tel Aviv-Pretoria axis against the struggles of the Arab and African peoples in South Africa, Namibia and Palestine.

62. The question of Namibia is clear and does not lend itself to misinterpretation. It is a question of the elimination of hateful colonialism, and it must be handled in a manner consistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Any attempt to portray the question as a part of the East-West rivalry is in itself a challenge to the will of the international community. Therefore, we must condemn and reject the attempts of South Africa to subordinate the independence of Namibia to its own ambitions and interests, as well as to factors extraneous to the plan for a peaceful settlement, in particular the linking of independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

63. While South Africa persists in its intransigent attitude, Angola consistently attempts to put forward flexible, objective solutions aimed at the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). These solutions are contained in a letter dated 17 November 1984 [*A/39/688*]. We hope that the proposals contained therein will lead to an intensification of efforts aimed at achieving the independence of Namibia.

64. The failure to solve the question of Namibia means that international efforts must be redoubled to bring about its independence and to give moral and material support to SWAPO, the sole legitimate and authentic representative of the Namibian people. Furthermore, the necessary decisive action must be taken to end the intransigence of the Pretoria régime, which persists in its repressive policies against the Namibian people and in denying them their right to free themselves from slavery. This is the major challenge facing the international community. Efforts must therefore be redoubled to reach a speedy, just solution of the question and to achieve freedom and independence for the people of Namibia.

65. It is an honour for me to express my country's appreciation of the steadfastness of the African front-line States, which are shouldering a heavy burden and facing a barbaric, racist régime that understands only the language of violence and terrorism, and to pay a tribute to those struggling against that force. I reaffirm that Sudan will stand firmly by the side of the Namibian people until right and justice prevail, the banners of freedom are hoisted on our African continent and the last pockets of colonialism are destroyed.

66. I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia—that Council which embodies the authority and responsibility of the United Nations—for the efforts it is making and for its programmes designed to ensure the fulfilment of its responsibilities regarding Namibia. I should also like to express my country's appreciation of the efforts of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We wish it all success in its noble task.

67. Mr. N. A. KHAN (Pakistan): Perhaps no individual in the General Assembly is as familiar with the question of Namibia, Mr. President, as you yourself. You have guided the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia for a number of years with great ability and dedication and have thus demonstrated your deep and determined commitment to the cause of freedom and independence for the unfortunate people of Namibia. Our consideration of the question of Namibia this year under your personal stewardship has therefore a very special significance.

68. This year, our debate also points to the gravity of the fact that colonialism in Namibia has now lasted a full 100 years. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African régime remains the most shameful remnant of colonialism as we approach the last quarter of the twentieth century, even though this evil has been banished from most other regions of the world.

69. On this solemn occasion, as the national struggle for freedom by the valiant people of Namibia enters its one-hundredth year, the international community must reinvigourate its efforts to force the defiant South African régime to heed the demand of the Assembly to relinquish its illegal and immoral occupation of Namibia forthwith. Our Namibian brothers also deserve a rich tribute for their deep and abiding commitment to the high ideals of freedom, self-determination and independence which they have demonstrated through their 100 years of unflinching struggle against colonial subjugation.

70. In particular, my delegation would like to salute Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, who is here in our midst this year after having suffered 16 long years of captivity and confinement in South African gaols. Mr. Toivo ya Toivo's presence in New York this year constitutes yet another element that lends special poignancy to our debate on the question of Namibia at this session.

71. The long and arduous struggle of the Namibian people, under the able leadership of SWAPO, has continued with determination and vigour since we last considered this question. At the same time, the devious machinations of the racist South African régime have continued to frustrate the efforts of the international community to help Namibia achieve its independence. It will be recalled that last year the Secretary-General reported to the Assembly that "we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)".

72. Even though more than a year has passed, we are perhaps as far from the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence, endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), as we ever were. Obviously, South African determination to obstruct the implementation of the plan and delay Namibian independence cannot any longer be mistaken by any observer of the scene.

73. During the year under review, South African efforts at bypassing the United Nations and evading the United Nations plan have been particularly conspicuous and apparent. In a move clearly designed to ignore the United Nations, South African Prime Minister Botha proposed in March of this year a regional peace conference on Namibia with the participation of SWAPO, the Multi-Party Conference, Angola and the UNITA[5] faction. As Pretoria's proposal made no mention of a role for the United Nations, it was rightly rejected by Angola and SWAPO. In a subsequent all-party conference on the implementation of a cease-fire and a settlement relating to Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations plan, hosted by Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda, South African intransigence resulted in the collapse of the talks. The same fate was encountered later by a meeting between SWAPO and South African representatives in Cape Verde.

74. South Africa's attitude of open defiance of United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia is largely due to the fact that it continues to enjoy the political and material support of certain Western countries and has been shielded again and again against effective action by the Security Council. The defence of liberty and freedom demands that South Africa's defiance be met with firmness and that South Africa be compelled to respect Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and co-operate in its implementation.

75. We are watching with interest the latest initiative involving the United States, Angola and South Africa. We hope that it will bring the goal of Namibia's independence closer. We remain convinced, however, that any endeavour which fails to put meaningful pressure on South Africa or substantively deviates from the letter and spirit of resolution 435 (1978) will end up in mere posturing.

76. The basic South African argument against the implementation of the United Nations plan is its well-known insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a wholly extraneous issue which should have nothing to do with the question of the independence of Namibia. This issue never came up when the United Nations plan for Namibia was worked out with the co-operation of the five Western countries of the Contact Group.

77. Furthermore, Angola presents no threat to South African security; the reality is just the reverse, as it is South Africa, buttressed by its vast military machine, which poses a constant threat to its neighbours. It has attacked neighbouring States with impunity on several occasions and has arrogated to itself the right to undertake such aggressive actions at will and whenever and wherever it pleases. The argument that South Africa's insistence on linkage arises from its security concerns is belied by its own behaviour. Moreover, South Africa continues to pursue a programme of militarization, which now even includes a nuclear-weapon capability, and represents a threat not only to the region but to international peace and security.

78. In Namibia itself, South Africa has created tribal armies and resorted to the use of mercenaries, which has transformed the Territory into a virtual garrison, with one soldier for every 10 Namibians. It is continuing its campaign of terror within the Territory against innocent civilians, a campaign marked by constant harassment, torture—often leading to cold-blooded murder—the displacement of whole communities and other inhuman practices. Namibia thus continues to be the hapless victim of ruthless oppression and repression. As if that were not enough, South Africa also continues to indulge in the wholesale plunder of Namibia's natural resources.

79. In this one-hundredth year of Namibia's continued subjugation under the yoke of colonialism, the international community must resolve to act decisively and refuse to allow the intolerable situation in Namibia to continue any longer. The Security Council must take steps to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without delay and, in the event of South Africa's intransigence, must impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

80. As far as Pakistan is concerned, my delegation has been making every effort to expedite Namibia's accession to independence, as a member both of the Security Council and of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The people of Pakistan, having suffered colonial subjugation themselves, have an immutable commitment to the struggle of peoples for self-determination and independence and take pride in having played a modest role in the advancement of the Namibian cause from the day that the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. It is our firm conviction that the inherent justice of the Namibian liberation struggle will ensure its ultimate triumph. We are convinced that the day of Namibian independence is nearer than ever.

81. Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the State of Bahrain, I have the pleasure to convey our deep thanks to the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President for their continuous and dedicated efforts. I should also like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his strenuous efforts to find solutions to the complex problems facing the United Nations and the international community, problems that need final and just solutions, among which is, of course, the question of Namibia.

82. We cannot fail to express our complete solidarity with the people of Namibia in their just struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, to achieve complete national independence and a free and united Namibia.

83. This year, 1984, marks the one-hundredth anniversary of the Namibian people's struggle against colonialism, oppression, injustice, hunger and economic backwardness. Almost all peoples in the world rid themselves of enslavement and oppression after an end was put to colonialism in our world, and, as distances between regions of the world continue to shrink, the interdependence of peoples increases.

84. The struggling people of Namibia aspire to achieve their independence and to realize their basic rights after putting an end to racial discrimination. The peoples of southern Africa in particular have suffered and continue to suffer from that abominable form of discrimination, which should have no place in a world that aspires to freedom, justice and equality.

85. The General Assembly, the Security Council, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, all called for an end to the oppressive and aggressive policies and violations of human rights perpetrated by the South African Government in Namibia and for the granting to its people of their civil, economic, social and political rights. In 1978, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted; it represents a good basis for achieving a just and peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia and a guarantee for the implementation of the United Nations plan, which aims at the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations, as a fulfilment of the Organization's direct responsibility for Namibia.

86. The Western Contact Group, composed of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States, must follow up their peace initiative by the peaceful political means which are available and possible, and the international community has a duty to move fast to contain this inflamed situation. The United Nations bears a moral, historic and political obligation to solve this dangerous conflict. Swift action is necessary in bringing pressure to bear on South Africa so that the relevant resolutions of the Security Council can be implemented.

87. All of us here are committed to guaranteeing and respecting human rights in order to serve man's aspirations and to help him recover his freedom and dignity. The United Nations bears special responsibility by virtue of its international and legal character.

88. My Government condemns the racist policy of South Africa, its persistence in occupying the territory of Namibia and its continued refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions, as well as its obstruction of all constructive international efforts to achieve a peaceful solution of this problem and put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. The sustained United Nations efforts last year led to the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of resolution 532 (1983). This resolution reaffirmed the legal responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia and the primary responsibility of the Security Council for ensuring the implementation of its resolutions. Power has to be transferred to the Namibian people and to their leaders in SWAPO. The achievement of independence for Namibia and respect for its territorial integrity and national borders is mandatory, and its independence must not be linked to impossible pre-conditions, such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Such linkage would impede implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and the re-establishment of its sovereignty.

89. South Africa continues to plunder the riches of occupied Namibia and to perpetrate acts of aggression against neighbouring African States, creating turbulence, tension and unstable conditions in those developing countries.

90. We believe that no peace, progress or welfare is possible in the countries of southern Africa so long as the question of Namibia is not solved on a just and

humanitarian basis. Continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia will cause further deterioration in the economic and political conditions in the region, and will increase the hotbeds of tension and confrontation.

91. The continuation of this situation will create feelings of frustration, disappointment and uncertainty. It might also weaken the United Nations and the faith of the international community in it. Solution of this question would consolidate the role and effectiveness of the Organization, which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia 18 years ago. Today the Organization must redouble its efforts to achieve Namibia's independence.

92. Mr. TANASA (Romania): Once again we are debating the problem of Namibia in the Assembly. Eighteen years have elapsed since this body terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and proclaimed its people's inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. The situation today remains unchanged. Namibia is still occupied by South Africa, and self-determination, freedom and independence remain a dream to the suffering and struggling people of Namibia.

93. Eighteen years of efforts by the international community to achieve freedom for Namibia have produced no results. At the same time, these years have seen growing international support for the just cause of the Namibian people, years during which there has been growing indignation within and outside the United Nations at the aggressive racist policy of the Pretoria régime.

94. Indeed, the situation in southern Africa and around Namibia has given rise to a feeling of deep concern and worry among the African countries and the international community. The liberation of Namibia from colonial oppression has now come to the forefront in the struggle to eliminate colonialism from the face of the earth. Many representatives have, from this rostrum, expressed very convincingly the determination of the international community to support the struggle for freedom for Namibia right up to complete victory. It has been firmly underlined that the United Nations plan for Namibian independence remains the sole basis for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia. Support has also been expressed for the continuation of the work of the Secretary-General in this connection, and there has been a call for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any delay.

95. It has been unanimously conceded that the settlement of the Namibian problem is a vital requirement, not only for the Namibian people themselves but also for all the peoples of southern Africa, as well as an urgent necessity in order to avert serious tension in the area and to ensure international peace and stability.

96. The United Nations position on Namibia is well known. Resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies, including the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations Council for Namibia, have clearly established that Namibia is a Territory illegally occupied by South Africa. The presence of South African administrators and troops in Namibia is contrary to decisions of the United Nations, the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law.

97. According to the report of the Secretary-General after the mission of consultations undertaken to southern Africa in his efforts to secure independence for Namibia, agreement was reached on the composition of the United Nations forces to oversee the implementation of the United Nations plan. But the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24*] underlines that South Africa continues to refuse to recognize the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence and that the occupation and the dangerous actions of the South African régime constitute a serious obstacle to the organization of free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision.

98. The need to proceed now with forceful and radical measures to put an end to the colonial domination of Namibia by South Africa has been emphasized time and again by the Romanian delegation.

99. As it has reiterated on many occasions in all international forums, the Socialist Republic of Romania expresses once again its complete solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Africa for the total liquidation of colonialism, for defending and strengthening their national independence and for their free advancement in the economic and social fields. Within this framework, we extend all-out support to the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to achieve their independence and the implementation without delay of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on securing Namibia's accession to independence.

100. Romania's position of support for and militant solidarity with the just cause of the Namibian people in their heroic struggle to achieve, without further delay, their right to live free in their land and on granting them political, diplomatic, moral and material support was reaffirmed in very clear terms by President Nicolae Ceauşescu from the lofty rostrum of the Thirteenth Congress of the Romanian Communist Party held recently. He stressed that:

> "We are actively militating for Namibia's independence and therefore we are fully supporting SWAPO's struggle. We stand for a halt to the racist and *apartheid* policies in South Africa. We consider that an end should be put to any interference by South Africa in the domestic affairs of the countries in southern Africa. In general, we fully support the African peoples in their struggle for consolidating independence and for their economic and social development."

101. The Romanian people consider that support for the just struggle of the Namibian people constitutes a noble task emanating from their own history and struggle for independence and the ideals and principles that we have evolved during our own struggle for freedom and in the period afterwards.

102. At this session, the General Assembly has before it for adoption a set of draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*ibid., part four*]. The adoption of those draft resolutions by the General Assembly will constitute a new contribution to the continued effort of the United Nations in carrying out its plan for securing Namibia's independence.

103. In conclusion, I wish to stress that, in the opinion of my delegation, it is of the utmost impor-

tance for all countries to act in accordance with the provisions of the draft resolutions to be adopted with a view to achieving the desired results. Only by so doing will they contribute to bringing to an end the suffering of the people of Namibia and achieving the independence of the Territory.

104. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): Few international problems on the agenda of the General Assembly have been so thoroughly considered and discussed by the international community during past decades as the question of Namibia.

105. Since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia 18 years ago and the creation of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory, the international community has been unanimous in its support for an independent Namibia. This world unanimity has been reflected in numerous resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, including Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

106. However, despite this overwhelming support for the independence of the Territory, the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is obstinately refusing to comply with its international obligations and, as a result, no progress has been achieved in the realization of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Namibian people. In its efforts to divert world opinion from the real issues involved in the question of Namibia, and despite the clarity and unanimous support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorses the United Nations plan for Namibia, the racist Pretoria régime is insisting on a linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Moreover, in its efforts to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, the Pretoria régime is continuing its attempts to set up puppet political institutions and impose an "internal settlement" in Namibia.

107. Although those efforts have been condemned and rejected by the international community, South Africa is obstinately and contemptuously persisting in its policies, completely disregarding the wishes of the people of Namibia and of the world.

108. The United Nations Council for Namibia—of which Cyprus has the honour to be a member—among its many other activities undertaken to promote the Namibian cause and the realization of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, organized in New York from 31 October to 2 November of this year the Symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle by the Namibian People against Colonialism.

109. This long period of struggle should serve as a sober reminder to the international community. The people of Namibia, for a century now, have been fighting colonialism in one form or another and are at present engaged, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, in a liberation struggle for independence and human dignity.

110. The international community has a moral and legal obligation to exert all possible efforts, as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, to compel the *apartheid* régime of South Africa to terminate its colonial and racial domination over the Territory.

111. In its report [*A/39/24*] the United Nations Council for Namibia presents a clear picture of all developments in and around Namibia, while at the same time referring to the activities of the Council and of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia in promoting the cause of Namibian independence. In this respect, we wish to express our appreciation of the commendable way the Council, under your able and dedicated leadership, Mr. President, is carrying out its difficult mandate.

112. Our sincere appreciation also goes to the Secretary-General, who has demonstrated his deep personal commitment through his untiring efforts to break the stalemate on the question of Namibia.

113. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus fully supports the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia. We feel that the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the way to a just solution of the problem. Any delay only prolongs the suffering of the people of Namibia and casts shame on mankind for allowing the perpetuation of the racist and colonialist exploitation of the Territory.

114. South Africa must immediately terminate its illegal occupation and withdraw its forces from the Territory so that the people of Namibia may exercise their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Elections, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), under the supervision and control of the United Nations, should take place as soon as possible.

115. Cyprus is fully dedicated to a solution of the problem of Namibia in accordance with those resolutions and will continue, along with other non-aligned countries, to give its moral support to the just cause of the Namibian people.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[2] See A/AC.109/L.1524 and Corr. 1, para 9.

[3] Subsequently issued under the symbol A/AC.131/142.

[4] A/CONF.120/8.

[5] União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

81st
PLENARY MEETING
Friday, 30 November 1984,
at 3.25 p.m.
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA
(Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 117

United Nations common system:

(*a*) Report of the International Civil Service Commission;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 119

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East:

(*a*) United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran) (Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee): I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly two reports of the Fifth Committee. The first deals with agenda item 117, concerning the United Nations common system. In this case, the Fifth Committee decided to deal with the item in two parts. Accordingly, the report before the Assembly at this time, which is contained in document A/39/718, is part I of the full report. It contains, in paragraph 9, the recommendation of the Fifth Committee which consists of a draft resolution adopted by the Committee without a vote.

2. The second report deals with agenda item 119 (*a*), concerning the financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. This report is contained in document A/39/719 and it contains, in paragraph 7, the Fifth Committee's recommendation, which consists of two draft resolutions, A and B. Draft resolution A was adopted by the Committee by 88 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions; draft resolution B was adopted by 88 votes to 11, with 6 abstentions.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fifth Committee.

3. The PRESIDENT: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fifth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

4. I remind members that in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the General Assembly decided that, when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

5. We shall first take up part I [*A/39/718*] of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 117, concerning the United Nations common system. The Assembly will take a decision on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee which appears in paragraph 9 of that report and consists of a draft resolution entitled "United Nations common system: report of the International Civil Service Commission (chap. III)"; it was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes too to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/27).

6. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of India, who wishes to explain his delegation's position.

7. Mr. ROY (India): The position of my delegation on the draft resolution on agenda item 117, which the Fifth Committee recommended to the General Assembly for adoption, was made very clear at the 37th meeting of the Fifth Committee, held on 29 November 1984.

8. I therefore request that it be noted in the record that the delegation of India does not associate itself with operative paragraph 1 (*c*) of the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly by the Fifth Committee in its report [*A/39/718*].

9. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will consider next the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 119 (*a*), which relates to the financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force [*A/39/719*].

10. I shall call now on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote. I remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

11. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): The Albanian delegation will vote against draft resolutions A and B recommended to the General Assembly in document A/39/719, on the financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. The position of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania as regards the financing and dispatch of United Nations forces to various parts of the world has been clearly explained every year before the General Assembly or in the Fifth Committee.

12. Our delegation wishes to reiterate that our negative vote is fully in accordance with the stand always adopted by us in the votes that have been taken on the financing of various United Nations peace-keeping forces.

13. The position of Albania is not prompted merely by considerations of a financial character. The reason we vote against such resolutions is of a political nature. It has to do with our objection to the creation and dispatch of such forces to various countries or regions of the world. We are against it because life and reality have shown, and continue to provide ample evidence, that these forces have not served, and cannot serve, the defence of the freedom and independence of peoples, or of international peace and security. Developments last year, as heretofore, reinforce our position as regards these forces, be they in the Middle East or in other parts of the world. Therefore, the Albanian delegation will vote against draft resolutions A and B now before us, and any other such resolutions.

14. Mr. KHALEEL (Maldives): My delegation will not vote on draft resolutions A and B in document A/39/719, and requests that this be reflected in the record.

15. The PRESIDENT: The recommendations of the Fifth Committee, in paragraph 7 of its report [*A/39/719*], consist of two draft resolutions, A and B. I first put to the vote draft resolution A.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 98 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/28 A).

16. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote draft resolution B.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 98 votes to 11, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/28 B).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

17. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): It fell to Turkey on 29 November [*78th meeting*], as Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to submit the report of the Council [*A/39/24*] to the General Assembly for consideration. Turkey, as a founding member, maintains relations of very close co-operation with the Council and has done so since its creation in 1967. We participate actively in the efforts made by the Council to fulfil its mandate as Administering Authority for Namibia until independence.

18. The debate in the General Assembly is being held at the right time, since it allows us to review the important events of the past year concerning the question of Namibia. There is much speculation about the recent discussions between South Africa and Angola on the possible withdrawal of the Cuban forces from the latter country. Moreover, we have watched the diplomatic efforts made to break the stalemate concerning the independence of Namibia. Turkey welcomes these developments and encourages all initiatives designed to lead to a free Namibia. However, we must assess the present situation very carefully, since recent history shows that, at critical moments, South Africa may resort to different types of stratagems in order to continue its illegal occupation and exploitation of Namibia and the repression of the Namibian people. Let us look at some of the aspects of the question since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

19. During the period covered, the question of Namibia has remained at the centre of world interest. Important events took place in the course of this year and restarted the political and diplomatic process concerning Namibia. First, there was the meeting of the Security Council to hear a complaint by Angola against South Africa. The Council, deeply concerned over the resumption of military operations, condemned South Africa, primarily for having utilized Namibia as a launching base for its armed attacks; but South Africa, far from taking that condemnation into account, continued to strengthen its illegal occupation of Namibia and carried out mass militarization of the Territory. To illustrate this policy, one must take into account the restoration of obligatory military service for Namibians, which we condemn.

20. However, one positive note was struck. On 16 February 1984, Angola and South Africa held high-level talks at Lusaka and agreed to set up a joint military commission entrusted with observing the disengagement of the forces from the southern portion of Angola. Again at Lusaka, from 10 to 13 May 1984, the first direct meeting between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*] took place. That meeting, which failed, showed once again the talent of South Africa for destroying all hopes at the very last moment.

21. The Turkish Government congratulates the African States and SWAPO, who have shown, throughout the consultations and negotiations that took place this year, a great awareness of their responsibilities and great flexibility, without at any moment yielding on fundamental principles. They have been guided by the ardent desire to put an end to the long suffering and the colonial status of the Namibian people.

22. If the illegal occupation of Namibia has continued in the field, the Namibian people have also continued to intensify their struggle for liberation and independence. In August 1984, the courageous Namibian people commemorated the eighteenth anniversary of the launching of their struggle for liberation.

23. The Turkish Government also wishes to congratulate the African States concerned for the efforts and sacrifices they have made in assisting the Namibian people to struggle for national independence under the guidance of SWAPO. The front-line States, like SWAPO, need increased moral and economic assistance in order to resist the increasing pressures exercised by South Africa.

24. The debate taking place in the General Assembly once again demonstrates the constantly growing concern of the overwhelming majority of States over the continued deterioration of the situation in Namibia. The United Nations has virtually unanimously supported the struggle of the Namibian people. It

is clear that there can be no stability, no peaceful relations in southern Africa, while the Namibian people fail to enjoy their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence on their own soil, with their territorial integrity intact, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. South Africa must be forced to give up its intransigent position and end its illegal and destructive policies. Moreover, we should make every effort to prevent South Africa from diverting world attention from the fundamental problem, which is the accession of Namibia to independence. The United Nations plan, which has been internationally accepted, is ready to be placed immediately into operation.

25. We must therefore make every effort to force South Africa to implement speedily the plan for the independence of Namibia. If we fail to do so, the heavy consequences of the prolongation and the aggravation of the present situation may dictate the adoption of decisive and urgent measures. In the light of the continued intransigence of South Africa, my Government considers that the measures at present applied against South Africa should be reassessed and strengthened and that additional effective sanctions, such as those laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, should be applied.

26. We believe it is the responsibility of the United Nations to make every effort to lead to the birth of a united, sovereign and independent Namibia. We are convinced that the debate taking place in the General Assembly will contribute to the process of the independence of Namibia.

27. In this connection, we would like to pay tribute to the unceasing efforts made by the Secretary-General to ensure the speedy implementation of the United Nations independence plan. Thanks to careful preparations, the United Nations is ready to put into operation the plan for Namibian independence. We trust that the desired conditions will exist to allow the Secretary-General effectively to continue his efforts to that end.

28. As far as my Government is concerned, we are totally devoted to United Nations efforts to ensure the total sovereign independence and absolute territorial integrity of Namibia and the unity of its people. In accordance with its firm commitment to defend the struggle against all forms of colonialism and racial discrimination, Turkey fully supports the just cause of the Namibian people and carefully avoids having any relations with South Africa in the diplomatic, consular, trade, economic, military or other fields. My Government, albeit modestly, contributes regularly to funds for assistance to the peoples of Namibia and southern Africa.

29. The courageous people of Namibia are making enormous sacrifices and have made enormous progress in their noble struggle. The Government of Turkey is convinced that they will finally win their victory in the near future.

30. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The consideration of the question of Namibia, like that of the other question connected to it, the policies of *apartheid* practised by the Government of South Africa, has always been given what one might call priority consideration at sessions of the General Assembly. Today, the liberation of Namibia is at the forefront of the struggle for the speedy, complete and final elimination of the remnants of colonialism from our earth. This has been quite clearly and convincingly stated by representatives of African and many other countries.

31. The consideration by the General Assembly of the question of Namibia at its thirty-ninth session is taking place at a time when the international community is celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the just and heroic struggle of the oppressed people of Namibia against colonial occupation, a struggle which today is being carried out successfully under the leadership of SWAPO.

32. The Soviet delegation welcomes the participation in our discussions on Namibia of Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, which is recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia.

33. The liberation from South African prisons of Comrade Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, who for 18 years languished in the gaols of the South African racist régime, as well as of other leaders and members of SWAPO, is a victory for the struggling Namibian people and for the entire international community in the long years of campaigning for their liberation. The United Nations and the international community must make further firm demands for the immediate and unconditional liberation of all other Namibian political prisoners, the champions for the freedom of Namibia.

34. The statement of the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization [*78th meeting*] contains a far-reaching analysis of the events that have taken place in Namibia involving a Namibian settlement. They show the firm determination of the Namibian people and SWAPO to continue the struggle until the full liberation of their homeland.

35. We should also like to point out the important and useful role in protecting the interests of the Namibian people being played by the United Nations Council for Namibia, headed by the representative of Zambia, the current President of the General Assembly, Mr. Paul Lusaka.

36. The United Nations has repeatedly condemned the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa as an act of aggression against the Namibian people and a threat to international peace and security. All the deadlines set by the United Nations for the exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence have passed. However, the united forces of racism and imperialism are undertaking desperate attempts and constant manoeuvres in order to create additional obstacles to the freedom of the Namibian people.

37. The South African *apartheid* régime has been refusing to comply with United Nations decisions, attempting to maintain illegal control over Namibia, which it needs as a real treasure trove of mineral resources and as an important link in the "constellation" of dependent countries with which South Africa dreams of surrounding itself.

38. It is no happenstance that recently in Pretoria there has been greater talk about the need to establish a "structure to ensure regional security" in the southern part of Africa. But, of course, everyone knows that neither SWAPO nor Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana or any other African country is threatening the security of Pretoria. On the

contrary, they are themselves subjected to pressure and attacks by South Africa.

39. In order to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and military pressure on neighbouring African countries, the racist régime is expanding its military-industrial potential and militarizing the country, even importing weaponry and military supplies and technology from Western countries.

40. A special danger is the assistance given the South African racists by some countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] and Israel in establishing and developing nuclear potential for South Africa. It is well known that in South Africa intensive work is under way to gain nuclear capability. Such a capability for South Africa is fraught with the most serious consequences, and not only for the countries of the African continent. Armed to the teeth and clanking with nuclear weaponry, the racist régime of Pretoria is a serious threat to the peace and security of all countries.

41. It is no secret to anyone that the racists, who are doomed by history and are in the absolute minority in South Africa itself and in the African region, would not be able to carry out their criminal misdeeds in Namibia and in the general area without the support of imperialist forces, first and foremost the United States. Not to state that would be to omit stating the most important fact.

42. The major reason why all decisions taken by the United Nations, the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in support of the just demands of the oppressed Namibian people have still not been complied with can be found in the fact that South Africa's obstructionist policy is encouraged by the United States and some other Western countries. These countries—and we should emphasize this—are not only maintaining but even strengthening their relations with South Africa in the political, economic, financial and military spheres.

43. It is the United States which is interested, first and foremost, in maintaining a "friendly régime" in Pretoria, one that is called by the current Administration an "historic ally of the United States of America". This régime is a major point of support in Washington's African policy and a springboard on the African continent.

44. The United States "peace initiatives" in southern Africa show that, in that region, Washington is concerned not only about the interests of its "historic ally", but about its own strategic interests and the interests of its capital. It is not by chance that, during the debate between the two candidates for the presidency of the United States on 21 October 1984, South Africa was declared to be a sphere of vital interests of the United States.

45. The essence of Washington's so-called peaceful activities in Africa was clearly revealed recently by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, K. U. Chernenko, who stated: "Using the carrot-and-stick formula and speculating on the interest of African peoples to live in peace and stability, the United States and some of its allies are attempting to impose their will on the peoples of the southern African region."

46. Of course, we cannot really speak of any objectivity or honesty in Washington's mediation between South Africa and the other countries of southern Africa. No, everything is being done with a view to maintaining the colonial régime in Namibia and blocking that country's liberation. That is in fact why there is a continuation of the artificial linking of Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, troops that are there at the request of the Angolan Government and in accordance with an agreement between Cuba and Angola.

47. All international forums—the United Nations, the General Assembly, the Security Council, the conferences of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the OAU, the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in 1983, and, finally, the symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle by the Namibian People against Colonialism, held in New York from 31 October to 2 November 1984—have sternly condemned and rejected the attempts to postpone the granting of independence to Namibia and to subject it to any linkage or parallelism as regards the question of Namibia's independence and the presence of Cuban forces in Angola.

48. As is well known, on 28 October 1983, the Security Council, in its resolution 539 (1983), rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978) and other decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, including resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

49. However, the United States, in carrying out a policy of "constructive engagement" with South Africa, has refused to support the latest resolution of the Security Council on Namibia; and South Africa, in turn, has refused to comply with decisions of the Security Council which set deadlines for a Namibian settlement.

50. At the same time, the United States and the Pretoria régime have increased their overt pressure on African countries to complicate the situation further in southern Africa and take the Namibian issue outside the United Nations and solve it on a neo-colonialist basis.

51. It is through this prism that we should take a look at the so-called peace initiatives which Washington, in collusion with Pretoria, has recently been attempting to put forward. The "peace initiatives" of the United States and South Africa are in actual fact nothing but a smoke-screen for carrying out the very same neo-colonialist policies that they have been pursuing in Africa.

52. There are, of course, more than enough examples of this. The fact that, in spite of the agreement with Angola, on 31 March of this year, on the withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory, Pretoria's troops to this day continue to occupy the south of Angola, is enough.

53. Are not continued attempts to blackmail Angola enough? Is there not still support, both overt and covert, for the Angolan counter-revolutionary organization UNITA?[1]

54. The clearest example is the letter dated 23 November 1984 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa to the Secretary-General [*A/39/689, annex*], which clearly showed Pretoria's hegemonist pretentions *vis-à-vis* sovereign Angola. In that letter we see an attempt to disregard United

Nations decisions and issue ultimatums to the effect that sovereign Angola should grant South Africa and the United States a "clear timetable" for the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angolan territory, and many other cynical claims.

55. Also, we cannot fail to take a look at another important aspect of the current strategy of the neocolonialists. They are saying that many sovereign African States are the "battlefield" between East and West. But even someone who is not well versed in power politics can see that all this is being done to make it easier under such a propagandist cover to interfere in the internal affairs of independent African countries in that area and to increase their strategic positions there.

56. In actual fact, the problem of the liberation of Namibia from the South African *apartheid* régime is a struggle between the national liberation movements in the southern part of the African continent, on the one hand, and the united forces of racism, imperialism and colonialism, on the other.

57. The United Nations bears prime responsibility for protecting the legitimate interests of the people of Namibia and their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

58. The bases for a political settlement of the problem of Namibia are clearly stated in decisions of the United Nations. In those decisions—in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978), 532 (1983) and 539 (1983)—we find the political basis for a just solution to the Namibian question and the advancement of Namibia to independence. In those resolutions, machinery is prescribed for making progress in the Namibian settlement.

59. The decisions of the Security Council confirm the leading role of the United Nations in the Namibian settlement by ensuring effective control by the Security Council over the practical implementation of all aspects of genuine independence for Namibia.

60. What we must now do is see to it that constant and increasing pressures on South Africa and those who aid and abet it will force them to comply with decisions of the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole. We must make sure that they take into account the will of the people of Namibia and the overwhelming majority of the States of the world.

61. The Soviet Union fully supports the demands of African and other countries concerning the need for the adoption by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. This can be done only if we overcome the resistance of those Western Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, who wish to threaten with sanctions, and resort to such measures in their relations with non-aligned and socialist countries, but each and every time have prevented the adoption by the Security Council of effective international sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa.

62. We strongly condemn the activities of the United States and other Western States which circumvent United Nations decisions on sanctions against South Africa, and we support the proposal of African countries on the adoption by the Security Council of additional sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa, including an embargo on oil and oil by-products. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly and decisions of the Security Council, it has no relations with South Africa in the economic, trade, military or any other sphere and, consequently, no treaty or patent agreements with the Pretoria régime.

63. We strongly condemn the continued plundering of the natural resources of Namibia by transnational corporations of Western States and regard the illegal exploitation of those resources as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant decisions of the competent bodies of the United Nations.

64. The Soviet Union is in favour of the earliest possible exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence while maintaining the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands; the immediate and complete withdrawal from Namibia of South Africa's troops and administration; and the transfer of all power to the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations and the OAU as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

65. In Western countries, people talk a lot about condemning violence, violent activities and so on, and they call upon the people of Namibia to refrain from such "unlawful" activities. But one wonders who first rejected the peaceful decisions and embarked upon the path of violence? Is it not the Pretoria régime which, by force of arms, is trying to keep Namibia in colonial dependence and refuses to comply with the relevant decisions of the United Nations that provide for a peaceful settlement of the problem? In such circumstances, Namibians have no choice but to continue their heroic struggle, with the support of other peace-loving States and peoples, until it attains victory.

66. Bearing in mind United Nations decisions on Namibia, including resolutions of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia, the Soviet Union has given and will continue to give full support to the just struggle of the people of Namibia, headed by SWAPO, which is leading the Namibian people to liberation, by all possible means, including military means.

67. The Soviet Union is in favour of a peaceful political settlement of all international problems, including those existing in southern Africa. Our view of any steps which might be taken to this end has been defined and will continue to be defined in keeping with the tasks of strengthening peace, eliminating colonialism and racism, and ensuring freedom, national independence and progress for all peoples.

68. The Soviet Union has followed and will continue to follow carefully the events taking place in South Africa. Because of its friendly relations with the front-line African States, the Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to the solution of the problem of ensuring their security.

69. Our delegation supports the appeal of the United Nations to the international community to give assistance and support to the front-line States so that they may be able to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of the constant acts of

aggression by and the pressure and threats from South Africa.

70. Mr. BERGQVIST (Sweden): Right from the start, in 1946, the Namibian issue has been on the agenda of the General Assembly. That the issue remains unresolved today should be of grave concern to us all.

71. Almost four decades ago, at its first session, the Assembly rejected South Africa's claim to incorporate what was then South West Africa into its territory. South Africa was asked to hand over the Territory to the United Nations Trusteeship System.

72. Almost two decades ago the Assembly formally annulled South Africa's Mandate for Namibia.

73. Six years ago, in 1978, the efforts of the Security Council culminated in the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed a detailed plan for the transfer of power to the people of Namibia under the supervision of the United Nations.

74. This historical record should remind us of the core issue—namely, South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. The United Nations, and all its Member States, must deal with that issue. This unequivocal commitment to the fundamental issue should be borne in mind when, as now, we are faced with attempts to focus on various extraneous and bilateral issues irrelevant to the United Nations plan.

75. Inside Namibia, we are witnessing a further disintegration of the society. The continuing war and the ruthless South African oppression threaten the lives of the people of Namibia. South Africa is attempting to impose its own political arrangements in open defiance of United Nations resolutions. A most serious development is the further massive militarization of Namibia and the brutal persecution of members of SWAPO and others opposing the illegal occupation. Recently, South Africa decided to conscript Namibians into the South African army to fight their fellow Namibians. The Swedish Government strongly condemns this violation of international law.

76. That the Namibia issue has remained unresolved is a human tragedy and an international disgrace. The credibility of the United Nations is at stake. Why, then, have the Namibian people for so long been denied their freedom and independence? Why has the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, failed to implement its many resolutions?

77. The primary explanation is to be found in the policies of the South African Government. In the long-term strategy of the *apartheid* régime, Namibia has become part of the South African cordon sanitaire meant to seal off the "fortress of *apartheid*". The minority régime also fears self-determination by the people of Namibia through democratic elections. The *apartheid* régime seems to be captured by its own prejudiced propaganda about SWAPO in an independent Namibia.

78. Another important explanation of why a solution to the Namibia issue has not been found lies in the inadequate international pressure exerted on South Africa. For decades, South African Governments have ignored the decisions of the United Nations. The Swedish Government has no illusion that South Africa will heed the call for international decency unless it is forced to do so. The repeated refusals of South Africa to abide by the decisions of the United Nations are clear evidence to us. Effective measures, including mandatory sanctions, are imperative in order to force the *apartheid* régime to cooperate with the United Nations in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

79. Ever since the adoption of the United Nations plan, South Africa has put forward a whole series of extraneous issues to delay its implementation. The most flagrant example has been the invocation of the so-called Cuban link, which actually was not invented until several years after the adoption of the United Nations plan. The Swedish Government rejects these delaying tactics and considers the application of issues alien to resolution 435 (1978) as unacceptable.

80. During the past year we noted expressions of optimism. Last February, Angola and South Africa concluded a disengagement agreement, and some stated that it was an important step towards a peaceful solution of the problems in the region. Since then, however, South Africa has demonstrated its intransigence, as is once again evident from the latest South African letter to the Secretary-General [*ibid.*]. Not only has South Africa halted the withdrawal of its forces from Angola, but it has also put forward special pre-conditions for their further withdrawal. In this context, the Swedish Government wishes to express its sympathy with Angola, which for so long has suffered heavily from the destruction caused by South Africa's aggression. The question of Namibia is not a bilateral conflict but a special responsibility of the whole of the United Nations. Angola should therefore be given increased economic assistance by the international community in order to alleviate this burden.

81. My Government also joins in the demand for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angolan territory.

82. History is surely on the side of the Namibian people struggling for freedom and independence. But the international community must ask itself how much longer South Africa should be allowed to ignore and defy unanimous international opinion, including decisions of the United Nations. Firm and decisive action by the international community is urgently needed to avert the disastrous consequences of South Africa's occupation of Namibia and southern Angola and to avoid the risk of the region's becoming an area of East-West confrontation. The Swedish Government therefore once more urges the Security Council to consider, without further delay, effective measures, including sanctions, in order to bring the negotiations to a speedy conclusion. We also appeal to those members of the Security Council with the means to do so to exert such pressure.

83. Pending such actions, it is imperative to assist the victims of the South African policy in Namibia. My Government stresses, in particular, the need to give moral and political support, as well as increased humanitarian assistance, to SWAPO. In this context, we commend the supportive work of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia in preparing the Namibians for their independence through the assistance programmes of the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

84. The Swedish Government also stresses that foreign exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia should be halted and that appropriate measures should be taken to that effect. In this context, I recall that there has existed in Sweden since 1979 a law prohibiting new Swedish invest-

ments in South Africa and Namibia. In a recent Bill put before Parliament, the Government proposed measures to make this law more stringent, and it will once again draw the attention of Swedish companies to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974. Furthermore, the Swedish Government has stated its opinion that imports of uranium into Sweden from Namibia are unacceptable as long as that country is illegally occupied by South Africa.

85. This year we are commemorating the one-hundredth anniversary of the struggle of the Namibian people against foreign domination. Next year we shall commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Let us now do our utmost so that Namibia can join us then as a full member of the United Nations.

86. Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This year we have had as many reasons to rejoice as to express regret.

87. We can rejoice that we are preparing to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the birth of the United Nations, where wisdom and noble principles have triumphed over disunity, sorrow and war and where the peoples, great and small, have been able to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and achieve a position of equality, regardless of their importance or level of development.

88. On the other hand, we regret that, despite all those principles, there still exist States where people continue to suffer from racial discrimination and occupation, and peoples deprived of the most elementary human rights. That is the situation prevailing in Namibia, still suffering from occupation by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

89. Even though the United Nations ended the legitimacy of the occupation of Namibia by the racist régime, assuming responsibility for administration of the Territory through the United Nations Council for Namibia, that racist régime has not ceased for 17 years its aggression against and brutal repression of all sectors of the Namibian population and its national forces. The régime has turned that country into a military arsenal, not only to perpetuate its repression and exploitation of the people but also to create a base there from which to threaten and carry out acts of aggression against the revolutionary and sovereign States of the region.

90. All those measures are a challenge to the work and resolutions of various United Nations organs, particularly the Security Council, as well as to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the OAU.

91. As has recently been proved by the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22*], the South African racist régime is strengthening its relations with Israel in all fields, and in particular in the military and nuclear fields. Obviously the goal is to strengthen their control over the people living under their occupation and to impede the development of the neighbouring countries, keeping them in a state of constant defensive mobilization.

92. The situation in southern Africa seriously threatens international peace and security. This should lead the Security Council to adopt strict sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, for in the absence of such sanctions this threat could well grow and lead to an overall confrontation in the region.

93. Mauritania, which respects the Charter, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and all other international decisions, as well as law and history, maintains no relations at all with South Africa. Our national passports are valid for travel to all the countries of the world except Israel and South Africa.

94. My country supports our heroic brothers in Namibia, who, led by SWAPO, are carrying on a just struggle for independence and freedom. We reaffirm the need to free persons detained for their part in the liberation struggle and to respect their personal rights, in accordance with article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

95. We also associate ourselves with the international community in condemning racist South Africa for its persistent occupation of Namibia. We reaffirm the need to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) so that Namibia accedes to full independence and the racist forces withdraw from its territory.

96. The revolution of the people of Namibia, after 18 years of struggle, has now reached maturity. The masses are no longer intimidated by terrorism, and the new generations are ready to face death in the cause of freedom.

97. We are happy to have heard the voice of the Namibian revolution from that great militant, Mr. Toivo ya Toivo, the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, who for 16 years himself suffered torture in the prisons of racist South Africa. Despite all these sufferings, his faith has not been shaken, nor has his profound belief in the final victory of Namibia.

98. Like him, we are confident that, with the help of God, our Namibian brothers, under the leadership of their national vanguard and with the support of all peoples and States that cherish peace and justice, will liberate their territory and build a free and independent State.

99. Mr. SOLTYSIEWICZ (Poland): Once again we are discussing one of the most challenging problems facing the United Nations today, the question of Namibia. On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we must acknowledge the sad fact that mankind has not yet been freed from the shameful system of colonialism. We are especially concerned by the plight of Namibia, where we see a unique combination of suffering of various kinds. After 100 years of struggle for independence, Namibia continues to be the embodiment of colonialism, institutionalized racism, occupation, aggression and economic plunder. The situation there constitutes one of the most flagrant violations of the Charter of the United Nations and of universally accepted ethical and juridical principles.

100. Eighteen years have passed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Yet the Organization is still battling to assume control over the Territory. The illegal occupation by the Pretoria régime continues, in defiance of numerous resolutions of the United Nations, the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

101. Recent developments in southern Africa show clearly that the *apartheid* régime has no intention of loosening its grip on Namibia. Moreover, the racist régime is exploiting the Namibian problem in order further to destabilize the situation in southern Africa. In the light of these developments, United Nations efforts and the plan for Namibian independence, based on Security Council resolution 435 (1978), are being seriously threatened. It is becoming perfectly clear that Pretoria and its supporters are aiming at bypassing the United Nations and imposing their own solution to the Namibian question. Following this path, South Africa and its Western allies are attempting to portray this genuine decolonization question as part of a global confrontation. Their persistent linking of Namibia's independence with irrelevant issues is another example of interference in the internal affairs of young African States.

102. These and other political manoeuvres, which are in no way compatible with bringing independence to the Territory, cannot mislead the international public. We are witnessing growing world-wide awareness of and support for the just cause of Namibian independence. Today it is more obvious than ever before where the responsibility for South Africa's intransigence and disregard of United Nations resolutions lies. There is no doubt that the racist South African régime could not have acted so arrogantly without the support of its Western allies, the United States in particular. This support for South Africa is motivated by political, economic and global strategic interests. By implementing the infamous strategy of constructive engagement with regard to South Africa, the United States, in our opinion, is acting, in fact, against the legitimate aspirations of the black majority of southern Africa, as well as against the right to freedom of the Namibians. Such assistance only serves to strengthen the Pretoria régime and, in effect, to continue the illegal occupation of Namibia.

103. Poland firmly rejects so-called linkage, or parallelism, and strongly believes that the United Nations and the international community in general must take more energetic and concerted action in support of the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, for self-determination, freedom and national independence.

104. Failure to act now will not only prolong the agony of the Namibian people, who have suffered intolerable injustice and oppression for far too long, but also inevitably lead to an escalation of the present conflict and further threaten international peace and security. Special responsibility rests with the Security Council, which must act without further delay to secure the implementation of its own relevant resolutions. If Pretoria continues to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan, the Security Council should isolate that régime through the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

105. Poland has consistently endeavoured to make a constructive contribution towards promoting the interests of Namibia. In doing so, it has always observed the following fundamental principles.

106. First, the people of illegally occupied Namibia have the inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia. The continued illegal occupation of the Territory serves only the sinister political, economic and military interests of racist South Africa and some of its Western friends. For that reason, my delegation fully supports the internationally supported demand that South Africa withdraw immediately and unconditionally from Namibia.

107. Secondly, Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved by the Territory. The United Nations plan for Namibia's independence remains the only internationally accepted formula for the peaceful transition of Namibia to genuine independence.

108. Thirdly, the genuine independence of Namibia can be achieved only with the direct and full participation of SWAPO in all efforts to implement United Nations resolutions relating to Namibia, since, for the people of Namibia, SWAPO is their sole and authentic representative. The only alternative to negotiations, if they fail, is struggle against occupation by other means, including armed struggle.

109. Fourthly, Walvis Bay and the offshore islands of Namibia are an integral part of the Territory, and all attempts by South Africa to annex them are, therefore, illegal, null and void.

110. Fifthly, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), together with Council resolution 385 (1976) and other United Nations resolutions pertaining to Namibia, is the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and must be implemented unconditionally, without modification or qualification. The crux of the matter, therefore, is not formal independence with a *de facto* perpetuation of the colonial exploitation of Namibia but complete decolonization of the Territory, in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

111. Sixthly, Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which calls for an arms embargo against South Africa, must be fully implemented, and the world community must warn that continued support for and collaboration with the Pretoria régime by certain Western States in the military field adds yet another dangerous dimension to the already grave situation in the region. At the same time, loans and credits to South Africa, as well as the export of oil, should be prohibited.

112. In view of the most recent developments, Poland condemns all the fraudulent constitutional and political schemes through which South Africa has attempted to perpetuate its colonial domination in Namibia. We are convinced that South Africa's brutal repression of the Namibian people, its acts of destabilization and aggression against independent African States and its policy of *apartheid* constitute a threat to international peace and security. In this context, Poland regards mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter to be the only available means to ensure South Africa's compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

113. The Polish delegation would like to reaffirm its solidarity with and support for SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We pay a tribute to SWAPO for the sacrifices made in the struggle on all fronts and for its commitment to embracing all Namibian patriots in an effort further to strengthen national unity. We are prepared to continue our assistance to SWAPO, in particular in the field of education. We shall continue to play an active part in the valuable efforts of the United

Nations Council for Namibia in promoting the cause of the Namibian people.

114. We share the conviction that the day of justice, honour and pride for the Namibian nation will soon come and that an independent Namibia will soon occupy its rightful place in the United Nations.

115. Mr. KURODA (Japan): Today, South Africa continues to occupy Namibia, just as it has for the past 40 years. These four decades have been a time of great suffering and sacrifice, and each day that the achievement of independence is delayed means additional hardship for the Namibian people.

116. The international community, particularly through the United Nations, has been working assiduously throughout this period to free the Namibian people from the yoke of South African domination. Since first taking up the matter in 1968, the Security Council has adopted 22 resolutions calling for its peaceful solution. The General Assembly has also adopted numerous resolutions, each year since 1946, and has held resumed sessions and special sessions in an effort to solve this difficult problem. A number of United Nations delegations, including officials at the highest level, have met with leaders in South Africa and other countries concerned. But despite these efforts, South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia continues.

117. It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the efforts of the United Nations have been to no avail. Indeed, I believe that, had it not been for the unceasing efforts of the international community, the situation in and around Namibia would be even worse than it is. The constant pressure applied by the United Nations, which represents the conscience of the international community, has resulted in a slight slackening of the reins with which South Africa controls Namibia, and there has been some tangible progress towards a solution.

118. A number of parties and countries have contributed to that progress. My country highly appreciates their efforts, particularly those of the front-line States and other African countries, the Contact Group, the Secretary-General and other officials in the United Nations Secretariat. Under your able leadership, Mr. President, the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the Territory's legal representative, has contributed greatly to this process by drawing world attention to the seriousness of the plight of the Namibian people. I am pleased to note, incidentally, that last March a mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia visited Japan, where it had useful discussions with concerned Government officials and with members of non-governmental organizations.

119. One sign of progress, and a source of hope, was the release last spring of Mr. Toivo ya Toivo after 16 years in prison. His indomitable spirit continues to inspire his people and to encourage all those working for Namibian independence.

120. It is essential that the United Nations and the international community in general continue to make concerted efforts towards the solution of the question of Namibia. In this connection, I should like to emphasize the following three points.

121. First, we should continue to apply strong pressure on South Africa so that it will heed the voice of the international community and not block efforts towards a solution. All too often we have been led to believe that South Africa was finally ready to comply with the wishes of the international community, only to have our expectations dashed later. We must not let such disappointments discourage us or cause us to soften our posture towards South Africa before the independence of Namibia is achieved.

122. For its part, Japan does not maintain diplomatic relations with South Africa; it is not engaged in any military or nuclear co-operation with South Africa; its economic relations with South Africa are limited to activities of normal trade; and it keeps its cultural, educational and sports contacts with South Africa to a minimum, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

123. Further, demonstrating its disapproval of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, Japan refrains from taking any measures which would, in effect, acknowledge the present status of Namibia. For example, the Government of Japan does not extend co-operation such as grants, loans or technical assistance of any kind to South African authorities in Namibia.

124. Moreover, Japan prohibits direct investment in Namibia by Japanese nationals and corporate bodies under its jurisdiction. In this regard, fully recognizing the political significance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] which was enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Government of Japan has taken measures to bring the Decree to the attention of relevant organizations and corporate executives in Japan. Consequently, no Japanese national or enterprise has a natural-resource concession in Namibia. Although Japan maintains normal trade relations with Namibia, the volume of that trade is minimal.

125. Secondly, the United Nations and the international community as a whole should continue to work towards the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which prescribes the only realistic course towards the solution of the Namibian question.

126. My delegation believes that we must not allow extraneous or irrelevant issues which are incompatible with that resolution to hinder our efforts to resolve the Namibian question. At the same time, however, we realize that it is not practical to try to solve the problem hastily, without looking into the complexities of the situation. In our efforts towards bringing about the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in a peaceful manner, we should try to devise a formula which is acceptable to all the parties concerned. For that reason, Japan values the recent diplomatic initiatives taken by the parties concerned to find a solution to the problems in southern Africa through a process of negotiation. Such efforts will, I believe, contribute to building confidence among the parties concerned, to easing tension in the region and to the early solution of the Namibian question.

127. Japan has long expressed its readiness to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In particular, the Government of Japan has committed itself to extending support in various forms to the operation of UNTAG, once it is established.

128. Thirdly, the United Nations and the international community as a whole should continue to provide assistance to the oppressed people of Namibia and, once independence is achieved, should extend co-operation to their nation-building efforts. Japan continues to provide humanitarian assistance to the

Namibian people. It has been making voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia since 1972 and to the United Nations Institute for Namibia since 1976. Following the achievement of independence, Japan will make every possible effort to co-operate with the people of Namibia throughout the nation-building period.

129. The end of what has already been a long quest for Namibian independence is unfortunately not yet in sight. However, if the international community continues to work in a spirit of unanimity and co-operation, we shall surely reach our common goal. It is our firm belief that, just as we have added a number of newly independent African States to the membership of the United Nations during the past several decades, so the day will come before long when we shall be able to welcome Namibia in this Hall as an independent State.

130. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Australia is fully committed to the achievement of the earliest possible independence for Namibia.

131. South Africa's occupation of Namibia is illegal and must be terminated. It is being continued in defiance of rulings of the International Court of Justice and decisions of the General Assembly.

132. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Australia has worked assiduously to achieve the objective of Namibian independence. We are fully committed to the implementation of the United Nations plan, within the framework of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which provide for a peaceful transition to independence in Namibia through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

133. When it was formulated, the United Nations plan was endorsed by all parties to the dispute. However, the South African Government has repeatedly found reasons to prevaricate and to retreat from that commitment. On several occasions, a settlement has appeared imminent but, unfortunately, has not eventuated.

134. Since 1978, South Africa has attempted to promote an internal settlement in Namibia as an alternative to the United Nations plan. It also embarked on a programme of destabilization of its neighbours through the exercise of military and economic power. This resulted in hardship and suffering for the people of those countries and the creation of a serious refugee problem.

135. The Australian delegation has followed reports of the negotiations which have taken place in recent months involving South Africa, Angola and the United States in relation to the situation in Namibia. It would be a matter of great satisfaction if those negotiations were to bring about an end to the impasse of many years. It would, however, be regrettable if these moves did not lead to the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Australia has consistently regretted the linkage between the independence negotiations for Namibia and the presence of Cuban personnel in Angola. We have regretted that this has been raised as a barrier to progress towards the independence of Namibia, but we hope that the current round of negotiations will not be a prelude to the introduction into the negotiating process of further issues outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978). The time is long overdue for the Namibian people to be given the opportunity to determine their own future.

136. There have been few reasons for optimism since the General Assembly last considered the question of Namibia. Yet, even in this bleak situation, there have been some encouraging developments. One such was the release from prison of Mr. Toivo ya Toivo, who, as Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, yesterday addressed the Assembly [*78th meeting*]. We also welcome the release of a number of other SWAPO members. There are, however, many still in detention and under banning orders in South Africa because of their support for Namibian independence and their opposition to *apartheid*. We condemn the South African Government for its failure to respect basic freedoms and fundamental human rights.

137. My delegation has listened carefully to the contributions of others who have spoken before us. We share their sense of frustration, particularly that of the African representatives; yet we believe that we must resist the temptation to vent this frustration in ways which will not contribute to the early resolution of the Namibia issue.

138. It is for this reason that my delegation is disappointed by the draft resolutions before us today. We shall express our views on those draft resolutions at a later time, but I should like to say now that we regret the fact that those draft resolutions detract from the efforts to mobilize a consensus on Namibian independence. The Australian delegation argued against some of the elements of those draft resolutions and against their general tone when they were considered in the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which Australia is a member.

139. In doing so, we were conscious of the fact that the draft resolutions of the United Nations Council for Namibia are becoming less acceptable to many countries which have consistently backed the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. The Australian delegation has been forced, reluctantly, to distance itself in the United Nations Council for Namibia and in the General Assembly from draft resolutions and programmes with which we are otherwise in basic agreement, because of the language, which is sometimes unacceptable to us. We hope that at this session that trend can be reversed so that draft resolutions on Namibia can receive the widest possible support.

140. In conclusion, let me stress the view of the Australian Government that it is of the utmost importance that peaceful means of resolving this long-standing dispute should be given every opportunity to bear fruit. The alternative is continued violence, of which there are no beneficiaries. We urge all principal parties in the Namibian dispute, and especially the Government of South Africa, to heed the call of the international community to bring Namibia to the independence which it so rightly deserves, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

141. Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand): The representative of Australia said that Namibia's independence is long overdue. Those are the words with which I was going to begin my speech, and I repeat them with due solemnity: Namibia's independence is long overdue. Six years ago, in resolution 435 (1978), the Security Council set out clearly the way by which the people of Namibia might at last be free to choose

their own Government and decide their own future. That resolution provided for a peaceful transition to independence through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision. New Zealand believes that resolution 435 (1978) remains the only satisfactory basis for a just and lasting settlement of the Namibian question.

142. What we have seen these past six years is a repetition of the tactics employed by South Africa to obstruct a settlement, in defiance of the international community. Its latest manoeuvre has been to try and make the independence of Namibia contingent upon the total withdrawal of Cuba's troops from Angola. New Zealand is opposed to this linking of unrelated questions. We hope that the current talks between South Africa and Angola will assist in overcoming the obstacle. My Government fully subscribes to Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which rejects the linkage of Namibia's independence with extraneous issues and reaffirms resolution 435 (1978) as the basis for a settlement.

143. It is also of concern that South Africa continues to toy with the idea of imposing an internal settlement on Namibia. New Zealand has consistently rejected all of South Africa's attempts to contrive such a solution of its own. We would regard any internal settlement as illegal, just as South Africa's occupation of Namibia itself is illegal. That was the verdict of the International Court of Justice in 1971. Even before then, the Security Council had called for South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia. It is intolerable that the decisions of the two highest bodies of the United Nations should thus continue to be flagrantly defied.

144. The consequences of South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia are wholly unacceptable. The political consequences are well known. South Africa has used Namibian territory to launch destabilizing raids and other actions against neighbouring States. Those actions have undermined the efforts of the countries concerned to better the lot of their own peoples and have resulted in increased regional and international tensions.

145. For Namibia's own population, the economic and human consequences of South Africa's continued occupation have been devastating. Despite the natural wealth of Namibia in minerals, in agriculture and in fisheries, the economy is close to collapse. South Africa has not fulfilled its responsibility to safeguard the right of the Namibians to their natural resources and to the benefits derived from those resources. Its refusal to implement promptly the United Nations plan has resulted in political uncertainty and reluctance to invest in the future of Namibia.

Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Vice-President, took the Chair.

146. The costs in human terms have been no less grave. The people of Namibia have not only suffered the denial of their political rights but have also been forced to live with discriminatory laws and practices in education, health services and other areas. Deficiencies in educational and training opportunities mean that the future manpower needs of the economy are not being met. Inadequate medical facilities, combined with the effects of war and malnutrition, have resulted in the reappearance in epidemic proportions of diseases that were largely eradicated 15 years ago. With the decline in the economy, many workers have been declared redundant and unemployment has grown. The struggle for independence has forced many people out of their own land. There is little reason to suppose that any of this will change until South Africa commits itself to the implementation of the United Nations plan and the people of Namibia can take over the management of their own affairs.

147. In the face of South Africa's intransigence and neglect, the United Nations has assumed a special responsibility to ensure that the interests of the people of Namibia are protected and its right to self-determination recognized. Since its inception, New Zealand has recognized the United Nations Council for Namibia as the only body legally entitled to administer the Territory. We Members of the United Nations have a responsibility to ensure the unity and territorial integrity of a future independent Namibia. New Zealand considers that Walvis Bay must be integrated within Namibia's territory, as declared in Security Council resolution 432 (1978).

148. Similarly, we have a joint responsibility to assist and promote Namibia's future economic development. To this end, New Zealand supports the purposes of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. To my Government's knowledge, there is no New Zealand firm operating in Namibia or having investments in Namibia; nor is there, for that matter, in South Africa itself. New Zealand also supports the purposes of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, to which we make regular contributions.

149. In March of this year, a mission from the United Nations Council for Namibia visited New Zealand for consultations. The Council's report [*see A/39/24, para. 1099*] refers to the joint statement issued by the Mission and the New Zealand Government on 20 March, which recorded broad agreement between New Zealand and the Council on all essential aspects of policy on Namibia, as I have outlined today. My delegation and my Government pay tribute to the Council's efforts, under the leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, to bring about Namibia's independence. We also reaffirm New Zealand's support for the work of the Secretary-General and others, including the front-line States and the Contact Group States, in seeking to fulfil the responsibilities of the United Nations to the Namibian people. New Zealand believes that SWAPO, as a major political force, continues to have an important part to play in the achievement of a settlement. We welcome SWAPO's willingness, which it has stated on many occasions, to agree to a cease-fire and to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan.

150. Only a few steps stand between Namibia and its independence. We urge South Africa to allow those few steps to be taken. If South Africa chooses instead to show the same obduracy as has frustrated past efforts to bring about Namibia's transition to independence, the United Nations will have to consider what measures may be necessary in future to enable Namibia to take its rightful place in the community of independent nations.

151. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation once again is participating in the debate on the situation in Namibia because we

feel it only just and appropriate to highlight two facts that give significance to this year's discussion.

152. The first of these facts is that Mr. Lusaka is presiding over the work of the Assembly. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, my country is fully aware of the devoted efforts he has made and continues to make to support the Namibian cause. My delegation hopes that this thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly will reach a definitive solution and lead us to the goal we all seek, which is nothing less than the total, absolute and unconditional independence of Namibia.

153. The second fact that my delegation would like to stress refers to the contacts lately held between the front-line States and South Africa. My delegation optimistically hopes that these contacts will continue and wishes to pay tribute here to the front-line States that have met at the negotiating table in order to find a definitive solution to this problem. On behalf of Chile, I would like to express the hope that future contacts will arrive at positive results that will allow us in the near future to celebrate the achievement of the goal that we have sought for so long. My delegation feels it timely to stress the favourable negotiating attitude adopted by SWAPO, and we believe that it is the best demonstration of the atmosphere in which a solution to the problem of the independence of Namibia can be reached. My delegation reaffirms its hope for a prompt conclusion to this issue and once again wishes to declare that the Namibian cause is the cause of all Members of the United Nations and is closely linked to the practical achievement of the principles that underlie the Charter of the United Nations.

154. Chile's dedication to supporting the independence of Namibia goes back a long way. It dates back to the very origins of the United Nations. In fact, in 1946, in the course of the first session of the General Assembly, the United Nations rejected the claim made by South Africa to consolidate its legal situation in Namibia and recommended that the Territory be placed under the direct supervision of the United Nations.

155. That simple fact has two very important aspects. The first is that from the very beginning of the life of the United Nations, there did exist the unanimous decision not to entertain South African pretensions and claims over Namibia. The second is that in 1946, when the agreement was adopted, the Organization had only 50-odd members, about one third of its present membership, and among them Latin America represented almost half of the membership. From all this it is obvious that the determined position of the Latin American countries, including my own, in support of Namibia dates back to the very inception of the United Nations and that our fervent desire for its total independence represents an historically consistent position.

156. Very incidentally, I should like to refer to the report submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24*]. I refer you to page 142 of the English text, which contains a footnote which is not in keeping with the text of the declaration that the delegation of Chile submitted in due course in writing to the secretariat of the Council. My delegation indicated this anomaly to the acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and once again officially wishes to declare that no Namibian rugby team appeared in Chile. My delegation therefore objects to the contents of paragraph 698 of the report, and we wish the clarification given here to be entered into the record, disclaiming the footnote that appears on page 142.

157. My delegation enthusiastically endorses the efforts of the United Nations to support the cause of Namibia and reiterates our hope that South Africa will understand that its position must be made more flexible so that, as soon as possible, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) can be implemented, as well as all the other provisions that will lead to a peaceful and final solution to the problem of Namibia. We therefore also reiterate our hope that the contacts begun will promptly bear fruit and that if possible, in the course of the next year, we will be able to celebrate the total and absolute independence of Namibia.

158. Mr. MAUNA (Indonesia): It was nearly two decades ago that the United Nations took the decision to revoke South Africa's Mandate as the administering Power over Namibia and to vest legal responsibility for the Territory in the United Nations Council for Namibia. This unprecedented action was in direct response to the obdurate policies of the Pretoria régime, which stood in glaring violation of virtually every relevant provision of the Charter of the United Nations regarding non-self-governing Territories. It was the only response possible, as it became indisputably evident that South Africa had no intention whatsoever of voluntarily relinquishing its colonial domination over the Territory. And the deplorable fact of the matter is that today, some 18 years later and six years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the situation in the Territory has moved no closer to the realization of Namibian independence.

159. Clearly, no one can claim that the Organization has not exerted strenuous efforts to force South Africa to terminate its illegal control over Namibia. Indeed, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous decisions to restore to the people of Namibia their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. Consequently, the Organization cannot be held responsible for the continuing deadlock. As the Secretary-General himself concluded in his further report to the Security Council, dated 29 December 1983,[3] it is South Africa that stands in the way of the fulfilment of our solemn obligations.

160. That conclusion assumes particular significance in the light of the tremendous activity by the international community during the last two years alone to make progress on the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. This is reflected in the convening of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983; the visits by the Secretary-General to southern Africa in February and August 1983; the Security Council sessions in May and October of the same year; and the extraordinary plenary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held in Bangkok in May 1984. Indeed, it was the growing concern that the United Nations plan was being systematically undermined to such a degree as to place it in serious jeopardy that gave rise to these concerted and tireless efforts.

161. It is to be recalled that their essential thrust was directed towards the Pretoria régime's unceasing manoeuvres designed to recast the terms of the United Nations plan by creating unacceptable preconditions for its implementation. In response to those tactics, the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia and numerous other international forums, such as the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as the front-line States, adopted firm and unequivocal decisions which condemned South Africa for obstructing the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and rejected Pretoria's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues. They declared that the independence of Namibia could not be held hostage to issues that were unrelated to relevant Security Council and General Assembly decisions and called upon those who continued to maintain such linkage to abandon that policy immediately. However, despite these important decisions it cannot be denied that the fate of the United Nations plan is even more precarious today than before.

162. As the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia makes clear, the situation in the Territory has reached crisis proportions. Especially disturbing are the conclusions reached on the military buildup in the Territory. This is fully confirmed by the fivefold increase of South African forces of occupation in Namibia since 1978, which now stand at over 100,000 troops, or one heavily-armed South African soldier for every 12 Namibians, and by the fact that South Africa is now spending over 3 million rand each day to maintain this stranglehold. Furthermore, it has introduced ever-increasing quantities of sophisticated weaponry, including squadrons of warplanes and mechanized brigades.

163. In the face of this total militarization of the Territory, the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, have demonstrated a courageous determination by intensifying the struggle to rid themselves of the illegal occupation. The military wing of SWAPO has accelerated its armed resistance to a point where the combat zone currently covers nearly half of the country.

164. In this regard, it is important to recall General Assembly resolution 31/146, which recognized the right of the people of Namibia to undertake armed struggle, as well as subsequent resolutions calling for material support to that struggle. A corollary to these decisions is the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa imposed by Security Council resolution 418 (1977). My delegation continues to be convinced that steps must be taken to strengthen the arms embargo, as its continuing violation has not only contributed directly to the massive military buildup in Namibia but also bolstered the ever-growing domestic arms industry in South Africa itself. In addition, we are faced with the distressing reality of nuclear collaboration by certain States with the racist Pretoria régime. It is incomprehensible to my delegation how anyone can countenance the possibility of nuclear weapons in the hands of an unstable renegade régime facing the legitimate resistance of the oppressed majority at home and an unrelenting liberation struggle in its illegally occupied colonial Territory, and which responds to the appeals of the international community with utter contempt.

165. Indonesia has been a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia since its inception; hence, we are fully aware of all aspects of the unceasing and, indeed, increasing oppression and repression of the Namibian people in all spheres. We have, on various occasions, recorded our condemnation of attempts to dismember the national territory of Namibia and the failed efforts to impose puppet régimes, as well as violations of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia by foreign economic interests, the ruthless exploitation of human and natural resources and the gross violations of human rights, including the extension of the abhorrent *apartheid* system to Namibia.

166. None the less, my delegation has devoted its statement primarily to the impasse in our recent diplomatic initiatives to achieve the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence and, equally, to the alarming military buildup by the Pretoria régime in the Territory. My delegation has done so because it has become convinced that, after so many years of bearing witness to the immeasurable suffering and sacrifice of the Namibian people, as well as South Africa's dilatory manoeuvres to perpetuate its colonial hold over the Territory, there is only one option remaining for the United Nations. It is high time that some members of the Security Council saw and accepted the necessity and urgency of imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Surely after so many years of futile efforts no one can maintain that anything short of such measures could in any way convince South Africa to abandon a course that will inevitably lead to disaster not only for the people of Namibia and the racist régime itself but also for the States of the region and the world at large. My delegation, therefore, joins others in strongly urging immediate Security Council action under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to overcome finally this unacceptable challenge to the authority and integrity of the United Nations.

167. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Namibia represents a unique responsibility for the United Nations. The international Organization began its consideration of this question at its first session, in 1946, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 65 (I). The General Assembly has been seized of this question at all its regular sessions since then, at two special sessions—the fifth and ninth—and at an emergency special session—the eighth.

168. The responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia was confirmed and defined at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly when it adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), terminating the Mandate of South Africa to administer the Territory and placing Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, with a view to enabling its people to exercise their right to self-determination and to attain independence. Then resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 was adopted. That resolution established the United Nations Council for Namibia, through which the international community would administer the Territory and take charge of the affairs of its inhabitants until they attained independence.

169. It is common knowledge that the South African Government refused from the outset to terminate its administration of the Territory of Namibia or to recognize the responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory. It has made use of all

possible means to obstruct the implementation of United Nations resolutions and the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to fulfil the direct responsibility entrusted to it by the international Organization. It has continued its schemes designed to tighten its hold on the Territory, accelerate the plunder of Namibia's natural and human resources and entrench its racist, inhuman strategies.

170. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) represents a landmark in the history of the question of Namibia. On the one hand, it provides a specific framework for a just settlement which would result in the Territory's independence; on the other, its adoption by the Security Council, the highest international authority for the maintenance of international peace and security, gives it special weight because the Council is the rallying point for all the influential Powers in our contemporary society, and all the parties directly concerned in the dispute have declared their acceptance of all its rulings. Hence, the international community was justified in hoping and believing that it was possible to put an end to the suffering of the Namibian people and that they could be granted their long-awaited independence.

171. Yet, here we are, six years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), and still the people of Namibia languish under occupation by South Africa, while their wealth is plundered and the Government of South Africa continues to tighten its grip on the Territory, increase its military presence there and exploit the Territory as a base for aggression against neighbouring African States.

172. The responsibility for the failure so far to implement resolution 435 (1978) is clear and unambiguous: it falls squarely on the Government of South Africa, which has sprung yet another argument upon the world in its series of attempts designed to impede the Territory's accession to independence. I speak of the linking of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to an issue totally extraneous to its provisions and certainly not under the control of the other party to the dispute, SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of the people of Namibia. I refer to the question of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, which now constitutes the sole stumbling-block in the way of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), an obstacle invented by the South African Government. It is clear from the Secretary-General's reports to the Security Council on this subject that this is indeed the same argument as the one that has been reaffirmed by South African officials on many occasions. They do not deny it.

173. The international community has on numerous occasions expressed its support for the struggle of the people of Namibia for independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole, authentic representative, and has reaffirmed the role of the United Nations in reaching a solution to this dispute, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), without any modification or qualification and without linkage to any extraneous issue. Here we wish to make particular reference to the final communiqué of the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, which called for the convening of an extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau on the question of Namibia [*A/39/560, annex, para. 43*], and to the resolution adopted by the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984,[4] which reaffirmed the legal responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia and the central role of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in securing the speedy implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). That resolution also expressed the categorical rejection by the African countries of the linkage of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to any extraneous issue and of the attempts by the racist régime of South Africa to impose an internal settlement in Namibia in which the puppet Multi-Party Conference would take part. This is the latest South African ploy to perpetuate its domination of the Territory.

174. Egypt, which was one of the first countries to recognize SWAPO as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people and in whose capital, Cairo, the first SWAPO office was opened, would like to reaffirm its firm and principled support for the people of Namibia in their struggle for independence under the leadership of SWAPO. Egypt also wishes to express its appreciation of the positive, responsible positions that organization has adopted in response to South Africa's recalcitrance and intransigence. This is clear in the statements of the leaders of SWAPO and their total readiness to collaborate with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in order to arrive at a just and lasting settlement of the question of Namibia. Egypt will continue to provide all possible forms of assistance to the people of Namibia, through SWAPO, until their aspirations to sovereignty and independence are fulfilled. This was reaffirmed by President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak in his message on the occasion of the commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Federation of African Journalists in Cairo on 23 November 1984.

175. Furthermore, Egypt wishes to reaffirm that the question of Namibia is first and foremost the responsibility of the United Nations and that the Secretary-General must play a cardinal role in its solution on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which offers the only internationally acceptable plan for a peaceful solution of the question. That resolution must be implemented without modification or qualification, with absolutely no linkage to other issues outside its scope.

176. Egypt considers it its duty to support the African front-line States in the honourable position they have adopted in continuing, in the face of acts of aggression and pressure by the racist Pretoria régime, to support the struggle of the people of Namibia.

177. In the face of the continued refusal by that country to comply with the principles and resolutions of the United Nations and the principles of international law, it is now incumbent upon the international community to consider the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

178. There can be no doubt that the Namibian people will attain their freedom. The day will come when they will join their brothers in the African continent who have already won their freedom and independence. Our responsibility here in the United Nations is to accelerate the coming of that day, to halt the daily bloodshed on the battlefield, to end the

hardships inflicted on the Namibian people, with whom the whole world has joined in observing the one-hundredth anniversary of their struggle against colonialism, to stop their suffering under the yoke of occupation and to contain a conflict whose repercussions could spread throughout southern Africa with unpredictable consequences and ramifications.

179. Mr. SASORITH (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Since the adoption by the General Assembly in 1960 of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*], many countries have acceded to independence and sovereignty. Unfortunately, there are still others which are awaiting the end of their long suffering, among them Namibia.

180. It is sad to note that 18 years after the end of the South African Mandate over the Territory and 13 years after the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice,[5] the illegal occupation of Namibia by Pretoria continues, despite the will expressed by the entire international community, even on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the resolution containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the 100th anniversary of the infamous Berlin Conference of 1884, which divided the African continent among the colonial Powers.

181. Despite Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, and the many pertinent General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, the exploitation by South African enterprises and transnational corporations has increased, thereby contributing to the maintenance of the illegal racist régime. This intensive pillage of natural and human resources, despite the recent Arusha declaration of 1984, which reaffirmed once again that those resources are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people, is leading to the rapid depletion of the once enormous resources of Namibia. Moreover, the diamond mines will be exhausted in 20 years.

182. The inequality and oppression are also manifest in the wide disparity between the salaries of black and white workers. For identical work, the black worker receives 6 per cent of what the white worker receives. Despite the fabulous wealth of the Territory, not a crumb trickles down to the Namibian people, though the Territory possesses the largest uranium mine in the world and produces various metals and minerals. Already, diamonds and uranium represent 80 per cent of total production value and 90 per cent of the exports.

183. To perpetuate its occupation, the *apartheid* racist régime spends 3 million rand daily to strengthen its military control. Namibia has thus become a veritable fortress. Pretoria's army, which is ensconced in a conquered country and strengthened by mercenary contingents and a great number of puppets created to act against the Governments of their own peoples, is not only terrorizing and repressing the defenceless population—of which more than 70,000 have sought refuge in neighbouring countries—but also has resorted to armed incursions and other destabilizing tactics against independent African neighbours. To install its Pentagon-style democracy and to struggle against the people's army for the liberation of Namibia, which has battled for more than 18 years with increasing success, the South African army—the most powerful in all Africa—uses an entire panoply of modern weaponry, including chemical and bacteriological weapons.

184. To reach its sinister goals, Pretoria uses other manoeuvres. In order to stop the majority of Africans from organizing for common action and to keep cheap manpower in reserve, Namibian society has been divided into 11 ethnic groups, in accordance with the policy of bantustanization applied in South Africa. This means that the majority of the inhabitants—that is, 90 per cent of the population—are confined in so-called homelands. All that is useful in Namibia—the agricultural lands, diamond mines and natural resources—that is, 60 per cent of the Territory's 825,000 square kilometres—is virtually reserved for the 10 per cent of the population made up of whites.

185. To preserve the Botha-style democracy, the racist administration also seeks to impose neo-colonial institutions on the Namibian people. The United Nations Council for Namibia and the international community have categorically rejected recently the impudent proposals emerging from the so-called constitutional conference, where the absence of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, proved that manoeuvre's lack of significance and validity and where free elections were not even discussed. The United Nations Council for Namibia also rejects the efforts to annex the deep-sea port of Walvis Bay and once again reaffirms that the port and the offshore islands form an integral part of Namibia, in keeping with resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the matter. It rejects and energetically condemns—as did the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries—any effort to establish any kind of parallelism between Namibian independence and any extraneous matter, in particular the withdrawal from Angola of the Cuban internationalist forces. The effort to link this problem of decolonization with the East-West conflict, as well as the mission of the Contact Group, composed of five Western members of the Security Council, serves only to temporize, to delay matters and gain more time for Pretoria. Indeed, the Cuban internationalist fighters were invited by Angola to repel the fresh attack of imperialism when South African artillery was threatening the capital of Luanda at the proclamation of independence by the late President Agostinho Neto.

186. In the face of the most outrageous provocations, SWAPO has always demonstrated patience and political wisdom and has constantly expressed its desire to negotiate. On the other hand, Pretoria has put on display its intransigence and dilatory manoeuvres aimed at delaying as long as possible the granting of independence to Namibia. SWAPO's readiness to accept a peaceful settlement of the problem has been manifested a number of times in the course of the past few years, both at Geneva, where, from 7 to 14 January 1981, a pre-implementation meeting was held under the auspices and chairmanship of the United Nations, and at Lusaka in May 1984. Those talks only proved once again the obstructionist will of the racist Pretoria régime, which has constantly placed on the negotiating table unreasonable and arrogant proposals. In this connection, the President of Angola, Mr. José dos Santos, stated recently: "Angola cannot make concessions

that will be suicidal for its national integrity and its political and social process, forgetting the sacrifices made by tens of thousands of its finest sons and daughters." [*See A/39/688.*]

187. In the international arena, many actions have been taken to solve the problem peacefully. In 1978, the United Nations, at its ninth special session, devoted to Namibia, expressed its total support for the liberation struggle, under the guidance of SWAPO, and urged the Security Council, in order to ensure the complete and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa, to impose sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, which brought together some 140 countries, recommended that Governments, organizations and peace-loving peoples of various countries examine urgently and carefully realistic measures to be adopted in order speedily to free Namibia from its illegal occupation by South Africa. The Bangkok Declaration and Programme of Action,[6] adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 25 May 1984 at its extraordinary plenary meetings held at Bangkok, reaffirmed again the position of the international community, namely, full support for SWAPO, indignation at the continued occupation of Namibia, reaffirmation of the sole responsibility of the United Nations *vis-à-vis* the Territory, as well the inalienable right of Namibia to self-determination and independence, and rejected the "internal settlement" which had set up political puppets. But we must point out that all those measures have not in any way disquieted the Pretoria régime and have only led certain Western Powers to abuse the use of the veto in the Security Council for economic reasons, thus preventing the Security Council from adopting sanctions against South Africa and allowing that country to increase its illegal activities and further flout the authority of the great organization that is the United Nations.

188. In the light of the odious situation that exists, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic associates itself with the call of the OAU for a political and diplomatic mobilization to denounce the persistent manoeuvres of the racist régime of South Africa, which has used every means to perpetuate its illegal occupation. The only basis for a peaceful solution is still Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provides for a cease-fire, the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibian territory and the organization and holding of elections under United Nations auspices. My delegation calls for the immediate and unconditional implementation of that resolution.

189. In view of Pretoria's evasion and hesitation and the intensification of its policies of aggression and oppression, it is high time for the international community to turn its determination into action and take more restrictive measures against Pretoria, on the one hand, and, on the other, to continue and strengthen its material and moral support for the final triumph of the noble cause of the Namibian people, under the determined leadership of SWAPO, whose President, Mr. Sam Nujoma, declared on 1 January of this year: "Despite the support given by the international community to our just cause, SWAPO is convinced that only the Namibians can fight effectively for their own freedom and free their country from the colonial oppression of the South African racists."

190. We are convinced that history is always on the side of people who struggle for freedom and against oppression. My delegation is also firmly convinced that the people of Namibia, under the enlightened guidance of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, which has raised high the banner of freedom and independence, will ultimately triumph against racism. The Lao people wish to pay a sincere tribute to the heroic Namibian patriots who have sacrificed their lives for the liberation of their country. Namibian independence will emerge and thus put an end to the last of the colonial forces in southern Africa.

191. My delegation congratulates the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia, presided over with dynamism by Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, President of the General Assembly at the current session, the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Brajesh Chandra Mishra, and many other persons and organizations that tirelessly make every effort to attain the total liberation of Namibia.

192. Together with other peoples of the world who love peace and justice, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic renews its support and militant solidarity for the Namibian national liberation movement, SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

193. In conclusion, my delegation appeals to the General Assembly and the Security Council to exercise fully their responsibilities towards Namibia to ensure the implementation of their resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), with a view to the rapid proclamation of an independent and united Namibia.

194. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Namibia is still suffering under the yoke of colonization at the end of the epoch of colonialism. South Africa continues to bury its head in the sand in order not to see the progress of peoples and not to witness a new era in relations between peoples. Perhaps it does not see the light because it thinks the darkness of colonialism still prevails.

195. In so doing, South Africa is committing a very costly mistake that is equal in enormity only to the crime it has committed against the African people. The role of the United Nations in facilitating an end to colonialism is not confined to preparing its death certificate. It is a role that carries the responsibility of mobilizing world public opinion, co-ordinating international efforts and providing help and assistance in order to achieve genuine independence for peoples which are still subject to colonialism. I should like to say here that all the efforts of the Secretary-General and of the OAU on this subject are worthy of our appreciation.

196. In today's world, the United Nations represents an advanced stage of development of human civilization, as well as a serious endeavour to give a truly universal character to human principles and values. Peoples have progressed through many phases. Mankind has progressed from primitive beings to rational men who seek to implement universal principles and values.

197. It is indeed a tragedy to see ourselves, as we meet here, stand at this rostrum and speak on behalf of our nations, reviewing these abnormal situations in human relations, in which the laws of the jungle and of cannibals continue to be applied. Such

remnants of a depraved age are most harmful to contemporary society.

198. Namibia, that African country whose men should be free, whose destiny is freedom and whose right is to freedom, is suffering under a ferocious colonialism that respects no rights and knows no limits in imposing its ugly racist, colonialist, exploitative policy. We salute and support the struggle of the people of Namibia, and we hope that before long Namibia will become a full Member of the United Nations.

199. What sort of people are those that appoint themselves the guardians of other peoples by force of arms, oppression, injustice and colonialism? Their aim in life is to loot the resources of the country and to exploit its people, not hesitating to use any means that will facilitate their exploitation of the Territory and its population.

200. For many decades, Namibia has been suffering under the dark régime of colonialist, racist rule that has become a shameful blot on the history of mankind. Eighteen years have passed since the General Assembly adopted its historic resolution 2145 (XXI) in 1966, which terminated South Africa's Mandate over the province of Namibia and declared the continuance of South Africa's occupation of the province to be illegal, placing Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The following year, in 1967, the Assembly adopted resolution 2248 (S-V), which authorized the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence.

201. The racist policy of South Africa is not a sudden development or a temporary stage in the life of its formulators and those that implement it. This aberrant approach to life and human relations is the result of a malicious, demented mentality whose treatment, even partially or gradually, has proved impossible. This disease must be completely extirpated in the countries it afflicts. Such ruthless exploitation of one people by another, including the theft in broad daylight of its rights and property, on the grounds of racial differences, shows moral, intellectual and social defects and perversion. It is a crime that will lead to the destruction of the society which is afflicted by it. History is full of such lessons.

202. There is no doubt that South Africa is on the road to catastrophe. It knows that, and yet it is becoming increasingly vicious. Thus we see the uneasy life of a people and Government which deal with other men in a way completely contrary to the natural custom of mankind. Such is the Government of South Africa.

203. In reviewing this ugly picture of racism in South Africa, as it attempts to draw Namibia under the umbrella of a racist movement for which it has found political, philosophical, economic and even religious justification, we as Arabs and Muslims consider Africa to be part of us, and ourselves to be part of Africa. As we review this situation, the picture of another racial barbarism immediately and inevitably comes to mind. It is zionism, South Africa's partner in all matters, from malicious ideas and actual practices to the nuclear partnership and exchange of interests and schemes. The General Assembly did not hesitate to define the nature of zionism. It defined its organic interrelationship with the racism of South Africa and decided, in its resolution 3379 (XXX) of 1975, that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination. Zionism and South Africa, each in its own part of the world, vie with each other in the repugnant nature of their harmful practices. The fate of the two régimes will undoubtedly be one and the same, as will be the verdict of history on them.

204. The *apartheid* policies of South Africa in the fields of education, housing, labour and transportation follow an ugly trend of horrible practices that affect mankind in all the details of daily life.

205. The dangerous situation in Namibia is a direct threat to peace in Africa and, consequently, in the world as a whole. We must mobilize all our resources to face the threat in order not to lose the opportunity to ensure regional and world stability and security.

206. I should like to affirm here the support of my country for the efforts of the United Nations to combat *apartheid* as a principle and as a practice against humanity, and for its efforts to restrain the inhuman practices of South Africa in Namibia and in South Africa itself. We fully support our brothers in Africa in their firm stand against the racist régime, and we share their commitment to the total independence of Namibia. We support and are committed to the resolutions that impose an embargo on South Africa. We call upon the United Nations system as a whole and every Member State individually to adopt a firm stand, to comply with the embargo and to support the efforts of SWAPO to ensure the independence of Namibia. We appeal to the international community to support the efforts of SWAPO so that Namibia may exercise its right to rule itself, free from oppression and exploitation.

207. How long will the General Assembly continue to repeat appeals about the injustices of man because the law of the jungle is not yet ended in this world, because there are still régimes based on the repugnant principles of racism, the denial of the rights of other peoples and the usurpation of their means of survival and the lands that belong to them and on which they live? Namibia is the country of the people of Namibia and it must be returned to them when it becomes independent. The longer such a return is delayed, the more painful holding it will become to the invaders and colonialists, and the greater will be the threat to Africa and to international peace and security. We support the efforts of the Secretary-General and of the OAU, and we shall continue to participate in them until the people of Namibia recover their legitimate rights in full. The whole world supports Namibia in its struggle, but do the racists in South Africa and outside it see this?

208. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): We note with regret that, ever since the General Assembly began considering the question of Namibia, the progress achieved has fallen short of our hopes. The adoption by the Security Council of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) aroused considerable hope of a peaceful solution to the Namibian question. As everyone knows, those resolutions, particularly resolution 435 (1978), won the support of the whole international community, and in particular of the parties directly involved in the conflict—namely, SWAPO and South Africa—at the time of the negotiations on their drafting and implementation. Unfortunately, eight years later, we now find that, despite the sustained efforts of the international community, neither resolution has been fully implemented.

209. The United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority of the international Territory of Namibia under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), has consistently emphasized—at international conferences, seminars, symposia and workshops, and during weeks and days of solidarity and reflection dedicated to the problem of Namibia—the urgent need for the prompt implementation of the plan for a negotiated settlement endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

210. The Secretary-General, who was given a specific mandate by the Security Council in resolution 532 (1983) to carry out negotiations with the parties to a cease-fire, with a view to securing the prompt implementation of resolution 435 (1978), went to South Africa in 1983, as everyone will recall, where he met with high authorities in Pretoria. He then went to Angola, where he was able to have thorough discussions with the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma.

211. It is clear from the well-documented report[7] that the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council after his mission that all the technical and operational aspects involved in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) were considered and were generally agreed upon.

212. That was true of most of the technical aspects regarding the composition, status and deployment of the military element of UNTAG and the choice of electoral system provided for in the settlement plan, including the so-called question of impartiality. However, all those efforts were, regrettably, thwarted by South Africa's intransigence and refusal to regard the Namibian problem as one falling within the context of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 14 December 1960.

213. Recently, the leaders of SWAPO have taken it upon themselves to meet directly with the Pretoria authorities, the first time at Lusaka in May 1984, and a second time in July of the same year at Sal, Cape Verde, to hold consultations on a cease-fire leading to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We must again regret that on these two occasions—each a missed opportunity, if ever there was one—South Africa failed to grasp the historic significance of the gesture made by the Namibian leaders to work towards a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.

214. At this stage, it is important to allocate the responsibility for the failure of the negotiations and consultations intended to lead to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and the blame lies solely with the attitude of the Pretoria authorities. Despite the repeated appeals of the international community, the sustained efforts of the Secretary-General and the clear demonstration of the open-mindedness and desire for dialogue of the leaders of SWAPO, South Africa persists in its stubborn refusal to co-operate in promoting the implementation of the Security Council's plan for a negotiated settlement and continues illegally to occupy the Territory of Namibia, in defiance of the United Nations, which, it should be remembered, put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia 18 years ago.

215. My delegation believes that this is the time and place yet again to condemn unequivocally South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, as well as its stubborn insistence on perpetuating its racist and military domination over the Territory through the establishment of the shameful system of *apartheid* and the forcible enrolment of young Namibians in the South African forces of oppression and repression.

216. The occupation that we are denouncing can be accounted for today by the deplorable policy of the Pretoria régime, which it does not conceal, of linking the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and thus the independence of Namibia, to entirely extraneous considerations involving the sovereignty of other States.

217. However, as everyone knows, the General Assembly, the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have categorically rejected the inclusion of any extraneous element in the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

218. The Security Council itself declared unambiguously in its resolution 539 (1983) that the independence of Namibia could not be held hostage to the resolution of issues that were alien to Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

219. We repeat here what we said only recently—that for us Senegalese, even if the question of Namibia has undeniable geopolitical aspects and implications for the region, as is true of any question of this political nature, it remains in essence and at its root a problem of decolonization that must be resolved within the context of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which recognizes that those countries and peoples have an inalienable right to self-determination and national sovereignty.

220. That is why my delegation solemnly reaffirms its conviction that a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question involves the immediate implementation, without prior conditions or any modification, of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which continues for us to be the sole, viable basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. The implementation of that resolution demands greater determination on the part of the international community as a whole.

221. In this respect, we urge the Western countries, which bear particular responsibility in the Namibian affair, to assist the Secretary-General in his efforts to implement resolution 435 (1978), in particular by bringing greater pressure to bear on South Africa so as to induce it to accept, without any prior conditions, the terms of the negotiated plan for settlement of the Namibian question. Their collaboration is indispensable if the intensification of armed conflict in southern Africa is to be avoided, as the conflict already has been prejudicial to the stability of the region and could constitute a grave threat to international peace and security.

222. Notwithstanding the failure of recent talks in May and July last, in Zambia and Cape Verde, my delegation is convinced that the efforts undertaken, directly or indirectly, between the parties concerned, should be encouraged, continued and intensified with a view to reaching a cease-fire agreement which would make possible the complete implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

223. We take special pleasure in this respect, during this debate, in praising the spirit of initiative, the realism and the sense of responsibility of the leaders of SWAPO, which is the sole and genuine representative of the Namibian people. We reiterate our

unreserved support for SWAPO and assure it of our active solidarity with its heroic and legitimate struggle.

224. Finally, I would like, on behalf of my delegation, to pay tribute to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar for having made himself constantly available in this endeavour and for his sustained action on behalf of the Namibian people. We wish to tell the President and the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia how greatly we also appreciate their dedication to the Namibian cause.

225. My delegation trusts that, through the concerted action of the international community, South Africa will eventually heed the voice of reason and withdraw from Namibian territory in order to enable the Namibian people to exercise their full sovereignty in a united, free and independent country.

226. Mr. BEAUGE (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): *Apartheid* and the illegal occupation of Namibia constitute an open challenge to the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations—that is, to the credibility and effectiveness of an international order based on the maintenance of peace and security, respect for the rule of law and the promotion of human dignity. For 40 years South Africa has been violating with impunity fundamental principles and specific provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. An appropriate reaction to such conduct is indispensable, not only to put an end to South African racism and expansionism, but also to safeguard the moral authority of the United Nations.

227. The events that have taken place in 1984 in southern Africa have in no way diminished the need for the Security Council to impose specific, effective and mandatory sanctions against Pretoria in order to uphold the principles and purposes of the United Nations in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. Although South Africa has expressed its readiness to seek a settlement of the question of Namibia in the context of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), its conduct continues to be incompatible with that alleged intention.

228. In point of fact, as stated in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24*], South Africa has not taken the substantive measures that would be logical if it were indeed preparing the Territory for legitimate independence. Internal repression continues against the Namibian people and persecution of leaders and members of SWAPO have been intensified. The economic system, which led to the irrational exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory, remains intact. Military bases and installations which make possible acts of aggression and pressures against Angola and other neighbouring States have not been dismantled. Recent decisions, such as compulsory military service for all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 years, are understandable only in the context of the continued occupation and militarization of Namibia.

229. International scepticism about the true intentions of South Africa is strengthened by Pretoria's dilatory manoeuvres and by the conditions it has set for full compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

230. In his letter of 23 November to the Secretary-General [*A/39/689, annex*], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa offers no assurances that Pretoria is truly committed to the objective of ensuring the true independence of Namibia and the definitive establishment of peace and stability in southern Africa. In truth, that letter merely shows a kind of power politics behind the South African proposals for an agreement.

231. These circumstances highlight the need for the Governments closest to South Africa to adopt a truly constructive approach and to demand of Pretoria an express and formal commitment to abide by the United Nations resolutions relating to the decolonization of Namibia. Those resolutions reject any linkage between the independence of Namibia and questions alien to the situation of the Territory itself and recognize the leadership and legitimate representation of SWAPO.

232. The Government of Argentina has repeatedly stated, and today reiterates, its firm support for the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia. We share Africa's indignation at the policies of Pretoria and most strongly condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia and the system of *apartheid*.

233. That position was expressly reiterated during the recent visit to Buenos Aires of a delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

234. Furthermore, in a similar vein, the Chamber of Deputies of the Argentine Congress, on 29 August last, adopted a declaration formally supporting Namibia's right to independence and self-determination. The Chamber of Deputies expressed

> "its fervent hope that the Republic of South Africa will comply with the mandate of the international community as a whole, expressed through the United Nations, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee against *Apartheid*".

In the same declaration South Africa was called upon

> "to withdraw forthwith from the usurped Territory, putting an end to the illegal exploitation of Namibia's mineral resources and allowing the people of the Territory, under United Nations control, to elect their own authorities and accede to independent life and self-determination, rights which Argentina recognizes as being inalienable".

That declaration, which was conveyed to the United Nations Council for Namibia, reflects not only the position of principle of the Argentine people but also a firm and concrete commitment to support actively the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for the establishment of a free, democratic and egalitarian society in its territory.

235. Mr. ALIAS (Malaysia): Representatives of the international community are meeting here once again to address a problem that has plagued us for more than three decades, a problem that continues to reproach the conscience of mankind everywhere. For that period of time, we have been seized of a question of a continuation of colonial subjugation which represents a fundamental affront to human dignity and a threat of increasing severity to regional and global peace and security. We have also been confronted with some very fundamental questions that test this body's credibility. How are we collectively to put an end to South Africa's blatant disregard of and disrespect for the will of the Namibian people to achieve independence and preserve its human dignity? How are we to prevent such acts from impairing the ability of the United Nations to develop a foundation for a lasting peace in and around Namibia? How can we allow such an arrogant display of

deception, brutality and defiance to continue endlessly? Regrettably, after more than three decades, we have yet to find an answer.

236. No introduction or elaboration is necessary to document the true motives of South Africa and the graphic violence of its illegal rule over Namibia; nor is it necessary to remind ourselves of the régime's brutality, which has permeated every fibre of Namibian social life. South Africa's colonial record has been one of outright theft, deceit, rejection of Namibian humanity and violence and repression of proportions unequalled anywhere in the world. The totality of the policy of theft and statutorily enforced racism of this régime is despicable and abhorrent. The Namibians are subjected to systematic persecution to ensure that all possible opposition is stifled and eliminated.

237. Systematic terror is used to stop all possible support for SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, in its struggle for independence and self-determination. South Africa has developed forced conscription of the Namibian people into the armed forces, an action which has caused many Namibians to flee their country. It has moved increasingly large numbers of military personnel and equipment into the Territory in recent years, in an intensified attempt to destroy SWAPO and create confusion in the region. It has intensified its war machine and developed the capacity to produce sophisticated armaments, including armoured vehicles, aircraft and munitions. It has increased the size and diversity of its military and semi-military units. Recently, and most frighteningly, it has developed its expertise in the production of nuclear weapons.

238. South Africa has developed a political system in Namibia designed to enable it effectively to control the political outcome in the Territory. It has engaged in subversion, terrorism and open aggression against neighbouring countries. It has never ceased to exploit the natural and human resources of the Namibian people.

239. Such acts, needless to say, have been carried out with impunity and in total defiance of the will of the international community. It is sad to note that time and again the United Nations has had to endure the bitter lesson that resolutions and pressure, even if they reflect the will of the international community, mean nothing to this defiant racist régime. Repeated attempts to enforce sanctions and isolate South Africa politically, militarily and economically have continually been frustrated by the support it receives from friends and allies. Every hope of a breakthrough in the negotiation process has been destroyed by the régime's lack of good faith and its procrastinating tactics. Surely it should be clear to every member of the Assembly that South Africa's goals have remained unchanged: to maintain chaos and instability in the area through subversion, terrorism, intimidation and open aggression and, through propaganda, deception and procrastination, to divert the attention of the world from its true intentions of exploiting the people of Namibia and sustaining its illegal occupation of the Territory.

240. Six years have passed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which has become the only basis for a peaceful settlement of this question. Yet persistent attempts have been made by South Africa and certain quarters to undermine the international consensus embodied in that resolution. It must be seriously noted that the credibility of the Security Council has been undermined because it has been utterly ineffective in implementing its own recommendations. Every Member of the United Nations is aware of the persistent attempts by South Africa and its friends to establish so-called linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola; and each of us is aware that these are issues extraneous to the United Nations plan which could serve only to prolong South Africa's domination of Namibia, impede the decolonization process in the Territory and interfere in Angola's internal affairs.

241. We have now reached a crucial stage. The atmosphere in southern Africa is charged and tense, posing a grave threat to regional and world peace. The tragedy in Namibia must end, and end quickly; otherwise, the consequences might be too frightful to imagine. The question of Namibia has become one of the most urgent problems confronting the international community; it is a problem for which every organ of the United Nations and every other international and regional body bears direct responsibility. It is the solemn duty of each of these organizations to put a quick end to South Africa's policies in Namibia and to its persistent and blatant disregard of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

242. Malaysia's view on this question is well known. My Government wishes to reaffirm its strongest condemnation of the indescribable indignities inflicted by the racist régime of South Africa on the Namibian people and of its intransigent attitude to the will of the international community. We remain convinced that South Africa has absolutely no intention of relinquishing its illegal and repressive rule over Namibia. But South Africa cannot hope to continue to entertain the grand illusion of perpetual domination over a land that does not rightfully or legally belong to it.

243. The Government and the people of Malaysia wish to reaffirm their unequivocal support for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and for the Namibian people themselves in their just and courageous struggle to achieve freedom and independence. We remain confident that their sacrifice, dedication and endurance will not fail them.

244. At the same time, Malaysia wishes to place on record its deepest appreciation of the valuable contribution and relentless efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the United Nations generally, to bring independence and lasting peace to Namibia. Malaysia firmly and unequivocally supports all the efforts and resolutions of the United Nations and other relevant international and regional bodies on this question. We reiterate that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must remain the basis for the peaceful implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

245. The international community must not lose sight of the fact that we are living in a world where, increasingly, one such crisis, if left unresolved, could not only be the cause of a major disaster but also serve as an obstacle to the strengthening of the organizations and processes which have been created towards the development of world peace. We therefore call on South Africa to heed the peace-seeking

will of the international community expressed through the United Nations and other forums.

246. Mr. MANDA-LOUNDHET (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): The establishment of the United Nations in 1945 generated great hopes concerning the maintenance of international peace and security and respect for justice, fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person. However, despite the praiseworthy efforts of the Organization, some of its Members, resorting to base subterfuge, continue to this day to impede the realization of these noble ideals. That is certainly true of the racist, colonialist State of South Africa, which, defying the numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, continues to keep the Namibian people unjustly and illegally under its yoke.

247. Since 1920, when the League of Nations gave it the Mandate over Namibia, South Africa has ingeniously and gradually applied its laws and its shameful practices of racial discrimination to the Territory. The year 1948 was a decisive turning-point for South African colonialist policy because the South African National Party came to power and with it came *apartheid*, that scourge recognized by the international community as a crime against humanity, an epithet which certain Members of the United Nations—and not the least powerful—strive to mitigate, through blackmail, in all bodies of the Organization. The criminal *apartheid* régime persists in Namibia, continuing to deny the right to freedom and self-determination of a people which asks only to live in peace and enjoy its Territory's resources, which have been plundered, exploited and depleted by the stubborn, mercantilist South African leaders.

248. We are certain that everyone in this Hall has read or heard the shocking accounts of inhuman treatment inflicted on the Namibian people by the racist régime of South Africa. We know that certain States Members of the United Nations are supposed to be keenly sensitive to situations that arouse their emotion, and we cannot help wondering why the case of Namibia does not arouse any emotion in them and why, on the contrary, they continue to contribute to making that case worse. Continuing the same train of thought, we wonder whether emotion is black or white. We leave it to the South African racists and their allies to answer that question.

249. Shameful, cruel punishment is continually meted out to the Namibians. Freedom fighters and leaders of SWAPO and their sympathizers are subjected to horrific treatment. Arrested, detained and deported to South African prisons and other special centres—the most infamous of which is Robben Island—they are subjected to "colonial law".

250. To thwart the national liberation struggle waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, Draconian racist laws and rules modelled on those which apply in South Africa have been adopted by the colonialist Pretoria régime. These laws provide for the gravest of penalties—the death sentence, prolonged detention, mass arrests, life imprisonment without trial—for SWAPO members and their sympathizers. In applying these laws, the police and the army have the right also to ban all sorts of organizations and publications which oppose South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. I would cite, in particular, the 1967 Terrorism Act and proclamations AG 9 and AG 26, which are used rigorously to stifle all political activity in the country.

251. In order to prevent the international community from being properly informed of its abuses, the *apartheid* régime has increasingly resorted to a system of house arrest of SWAPO militants. As soon as such persons are released from gaol they are immediately placed under house arrest. They are totally prohibited from receiving any visit or being involved in any meeting whatsoever. Even more distressing are the disappearances of these former prisoners, which have become commonplace.

252. According to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

> "Some 200 people were reported to have been arrested for trespassing in March 1982 at the bachelors' quarters in Katutura, outside of Windhoek. Bachelors' quarters are substandard dwellings in which Africans employed or seeking employment in the so-called Police Zone must live separated from their families. Only people in possession of permits are officially allowed to reside in the bachelors' quarters, which are frequently raided by the police.
>
> ". . . during police raids on Katutura between June and August 1982, 447 'illegal residents' were arrested."[8]

253. The same report shows that, "according to evidence compiled by SWAPO, many Namibian detainees are being held in secret prisons and detention camps located in thick forest areas in the Otavi and Grootfontein districts."[9] Many prisoners are believed to be held in underground cells.

254. In spite of General Assembly resolution 37/233 A, which was adopted on the recommendation of the United Nations Council for Namibia and which demands that South Africa immediately release all Namibian political prisoners, the Pretoria régime is relentlessly pursuing its cruel plans for the Territory.

255. The release of Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, after 18 years of imprisonment represents a victory for the international campaign that was waged on his behalf. We were highly gratified to welcome him to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

256. As everyone knows, Namibia has vast economic potential. Its subsoil, in particular, contains uranium—indeed, it is one of the leading world producers of that mineral. It has diamonds, manganese, copper, lead and other minerals. Its agriculture is prosperous and fishing excellent. However, all that wealth is controlled and forcibly and wrongfully exploited by the racist South African settlers and their allies. According to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Namibian economy is a product of decades of exploitation by South African and other foreign economic interests of the extensive natural resources of the Territory and its African labour force.

257. Those companies enjoy various benefits, among which are more lenient tax laws than exist in South Africa, advantageous arrangements for capital depreciation, no restriction on ore production, no obligation to process minerals locally and no obligation to reinvest in the country.

258. Transnational corporations of all kinds have found in Namibia a happy hunting ground. One might be misled into thinking that the Namibian population is receiving the beneficial fall-out of that transnational presence, but nothing could be further from the truth. The transnational corporations are in no way obligated to invest a portion of their vast profits in Namibia for the development of Namibia's infrastructure or for any other purpose, and there is therefore a wide gap between the Territory's gross domestic product and its gross national product.

259. We can take, for example, the mining sector, a sector that is wholly export oriented and which accounts for the bulk of the Territory's gross domestic product—approximately 50 per cent. It is the chief source of foreign exchange earnings; yet the country received only 21 million rand from the sale of minerals—with the exception of diamonds—which amounted to 920 million rand, or 2.3 per cent from 1976 to 1981.

260. The economic system is such that the black population is getting poorer and the whites are getting richer, while the transnational corporations are reaping super-profits. General Assembly resolutions 32/35, 33/40, 34/41, 35/28 and 36/51 single out a certain number of Western countries as the principal trading partners of South Africa.

261. According to the same sources, more than 88 transnational corporations are operating in Namibia. Those corporations, as we have said, benefit from privileged treatment by the South African régime.

262. In such a context, where conduct is guided by self-interest, it is easy to understand the stubborn refusal of the *apartheid* régime to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions.

263. Given the current rate of exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, it is to be feared that they will be exhausted much sooner than might have been the case. Where fishing is concerned, for example, voices have been raised in alarm deploring the catastrophic state of pilchard and anchovy fisheries, which are being heedlessly exploited with the result that the major fishing areas have been decimated. Abetted by corruption, fishing quotas are broadly exceeded in spite of prohibitions.

264. Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia[2] and resolution 37/233 A, in which the General Assembly strongly condemned the activities of all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia under the illegal South African administration, are both being violated daily.

265. With the blessing of its Western allies, South Africa has carefully set up an awesome defence system in Namibia. That system ranges from the protection of mining installations to the overall militarization of Namibian territory. For example, a security programme has been set up at the Rössing mine as the result of an agreement made between the South African régime and the executives of that corporation. That security programme provides for the organization of a 69-man paramilitary unit prepared to cope with social unrest at any time.

266. According to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the buildup of military power in the Territory is so great that there is now one racist soldier for every 12 Namibians. The South African forces, estimated to be 100,000 strong, are stationed in some 90 bases, the largest of which are Windhoek, Walvis Bay, Grootfontein, Omega, Ruacana, Mpancha and so on. Those forces are being increased as preparations go forward for acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring States from Namibian territory.

267. The international community should also be made aware that Pretoria is making increasing use of mercenaries and has installed compulsory military service in Namibia in order to consolidate its colonial administration. And, as everyone knows, that State has already moved into the nuclear era.

268. It is to be feared that, once it achieves independence, Namibia will be the victim of South African raids setting out from Walvis Bay, a Namibian port which the colonial régime is trying to annex.

269. In order to thwart this diabolical idea of annexation, the Security Council, on 27 July 1978, adopted resolution 432 (1978) in which it declared that: "the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia must be assured through the reintegration of Walvis Bay within its territory" and that "South Africa must not use Walvis Bay in any manner prejudicial to the independence of Namibia."

270. Today, Namibia has been turned into a vast garrison State where terror stalks the land. The South African army practises all kinds of acts of intimidation on the peaceful and innocent people. Villagers are tortured and massacred, their property is looted and their women raped, and this can happen at any time.

271. Having to endure such treatment, a considerable number of the Namibian people have been obliged to seek exile in neighbouring countries. For example, it is estimated that there are more than 70,000 Namibian refugees now in Angola, more than 4,800 in Zambia and some in Botswana and other neighbouring countries. The valiant SWAPO is doing its utmost not only to meet their essential needs but also to provide them with education and political training which is necessary for the reconstruction of the country after independence.

272. We believe that the efforts being made by SWAPO should continue to have the support of the international community in order that it may complete its work and thus attain the ultimate objective, which is independence for Namibia.

273. The People's Republic of the Congo has taken part effectively in the scholarship programme for Namibia in the period from 1 July 1982 to 30 June 1983, along with 12 other countries. The effort of my country to help Namibia secure self-determination did not stop there. We have also provided moral support, and our support will be increased in the days ahead.

274. The Congolese delegation endorses the declaration contained in the final communiqué of the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, which "reaffirmed the primary responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia and that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remained the only basis for a peaceful settlement" [*see A/39/560, annex, para. 35*].

275. The Namibian problem is central among the concerns of the Congolese authorities. That is why the delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo appeals to the Western States involved to stop the aid which they have been giving to the *apartheid* régime, and we appeal to international public opinion to

become involved more dynamically in opposing the machiavellian determination of South Africa in order that Namibia will at last join us in the comity of free sovereign nations.

276. Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia): Not long ago, the General Assembly considered the policies of *apartheid* practised by South Africa and its consequences for the peoples of southern Africa, including the people of Namibia. Those who spoke were unanimous in condemning the racist régime of South Africa for spreading the inhuman policy of *apartheid* to the international Territory of Namibia and subjecting the indigenous people of the Territory to racial oppression and colonial exploitation. Now the General Assembly is taking up the question of Namibia as a separate item with a view to finding a proper solution to this acute problem.

277. The situation prevailing in and around Namibia is indeed abnormal and is no longer tolerable. Though 18 years have passed since South Africa's Mandate was terminated, the racist régime of Pretoria continues illegally to occupy the Territory and to challenge the United Nations and the international community, arrogantly defying their relevant decisions and just demands.

278. Today Namibia has turned entirely into a colony of South Africa in which we witness manifestations of the worst forms of colonialism, occupation and *apartheid*. The human and natural resources of the Territory are being ruthlessly exploited and plundered by the South African racist régime and by imperialist monopolies.

279. The resistance of the indigenous people and their legitimate struggle for freedom and independence are being brutally suppressed. In order to reinforce its illegal occupation of, and colonial and racial domination over, the Territory, racist authorities are engaged intensively in a large-scale military buildup, even resorting to the use of mercenaries. Moreover, Namibian territory is used for acts of aggression against independent African States, which poses a threat to international peace and security.

280. Along with the use of force and in complete disregard of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, the racist régime of Pretoria resorts to all kinds of manoeuvres to perpetuate its racial domination, including the policy of bantustanization, internal settlement and, under various pretexts, delaying tactics, to bypass the United Nations and to undermine its decisions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorses the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence, the only acceptable basis for a peaceful, just settlement of the Namibian question.

281. Since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), South Africa has continued with its obstruction of the independence of Namibia. In addition to its insistence on linking the independence of Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant issues, the Pretoria régime is now demanding that SWAPO lay down its arms unilaterally, cease its struggle, which has been recognized as legitimate by the world community, and participate in Pretoria's sinister schemes for a puppet solution to the Namibian problem outside the framework of resolution 435 (1978).

282. From all this, it is crystal clear that South Africa has no intention of withdrawing from Namibia. In the present situation, it becomes ever more imperative for the international community to redouble its efforts in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence without further delay.

283. As we have time and again stated here, the reason for the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia, the repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring States by South Africa, and the delay in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence lies in the double-standard policies of the United States and other Western Powers, which continue to collaborate closely with the racist régime of South Africa in all fields, including the nuclear field. In this connection, I would like to point out especially the negative role that the United States plays in this matter. In addition to the generous aid the United States gives to the racist régime, it has repeatedly blocked the adoption of effective measures by the United Nations and has adopted the so-called policy of constructive engagement and insisted on the linkage of the South African withdrawal from Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant issues, including the withdrawal of Cuban contingents from Angola, thus encouraging and emboldening the Pretoria régime in its intransigence and persistence in prolonging its domination in Namibia.

284. Any support, direct or indirect, for the manoeuvres of the Pretoria racist régime to delay the genuine independence of Namibia or to intimidate independent African States is not only a hostile act against those States but also a challenge to the international community.

285. Along with the condemnation of South Africa's policies of occupation, *apartheid* and domination pursued in Namibia, South Africa's allies and partners should also be condemned as accomplices in the criminal policies of the Pretoria régime. My delegation joins in the demand that comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, be applied against South Africa.

286. Despite the continuing brutal repression and terror of the occupation, the people of Namibia are carrying on their heroic struggle for freedom and independence, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO. Like any other people, the people of Namibia are entitled to political independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity in their own country, and that includes Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

287. The Mongolian delegation wishes to reaffirm its whole-hearted support for the just struggle of the Namibian people against imperialism, *apartheid* and colonialism. It expresses once again its sympathy and solidarity with the people of Namibia and all the Namibian patriots. We also express our solidarity with and admiration for the firm and yet flexible stand of the front-line States in dealing with South Africa, as vividly demonstrated in the recent proposal put forward by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola.

288. In conclusion, we express our appreciation to the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for their tireless

efforts to bring freedom and independence to the people of Namibia.

289. We fully support the recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has been prepared and adopted under the experienced and dedicated guidance of Mr. Paul Lusaka.

290. Mr. JANKU (Albania): The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa remains one of the most shameful remnants of colonialism of our time. The just and final solution of the Namibian question is a matter of concern not only to the Namibian people, who bear the burden of the racist occupation on their own shoulders, as do other African peoples, but also to all the peoples that cherish freedom, peace and justice the world over.

291. During the deliberations of this session, the representatives of various democratic and peace-loving countries, in condemning the racist policy of *apartheid* exercised by the Fascists of South Africa, are at the same time presenting fresh evidence testifying to the intensification of the barbarous repression of the Pretoria régime. During the past year, the racists of South Africa have continued to strengthen their grip on the Territory by exercising with more brutality the abhorrent policy of *apartheid* against the Namibian and Azanian peoples. Arbitrary arrests, barbaric torture and summary executions are daily occurrences. The Namibian people are suffering from a cruel genocide aimed at their total liquidation.

Mr. Sallam (Yemen), Vice-President, took the Chair.

292. By arrogantly and stubbornly disregarding world public opinion and openly ignoring the decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations, either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council, or other international forums, the Fascist Pretoria régime is making ever more clear its true character and role as the gendarme of American imperialism in southern Africa and as a defender of the interests of neo-colonialism, multinational corporations and world reactionism. By so doing, this Fascist régime demonstrates that it has not and never has had the least intention of voluntarily renouncing its colonial domination over Namibia. On the contrary, South Africa has strengthened the military occupation of that country and increased its economic exploitation.

293. The legitimate aspirations and just demands of the Namibian people for freedom, national independence and social justice are still faced with countless new obstacles because of the plots and intrigues hatched by the Fascist régime of South Africa and other imperialist Powers that support it. Now more than ever before it has become very evident that South Africa and its allies, particularly the United States, are not and never have been interested in the settlement of the Namibian question. They are interested only in a settlement acceptable to themselves and compatible with the system of *apartheid.* That being so, the forces of imperialism and reaction, in fact, do nothing but support South Africa in perpetuating its colonial occupation of Namibia, support which is being given not only in the political field but in the military field as well. The military machine of the racists of South Africa is equipped and continues to be armed by their masters in Washington, who for their part do not spare any military assistance in order to achieve their own interests. It is this all-round support granted to South Africa by imperialist Powers, the United States in particular, which has made the Fascists of Pretoria more arrogant and unrestrained in applying their racist policy.

294. Despite all the demagogical fuss being made about the alleged aid they provide to the Namibian and other African peoples, the Soviet social-imperialists in fact are but false friends to them. They make every effort to penetrate the national liberation movements in order to achieve their own predatory aims.

295. The Albanian delegation shares the view that there will be no genuine solution to the question of Namibia as a result of negotiations and in accordance with the schemes and manoeuvres of the enemies of the Namibian people. South Africa should once and for all withdraw its troops from the territory of Namibia and give up its aggressive policy towards the countries of southern Africa. At the same time, an end should be put to the interference and intrigues of the super-Powers in Namibia, granting the Namibian people the right to decide their own destiny.

296. Life itself and the course of the latest events have made it even clearer that their determined struggle is the only just path that can lead the Namibian people towards the achievement of their rights and aspirations. Whatever temporary difficulties and obstacles are created by the interference and intrigues of the super-Powers and other imperialist Powers in Africa, whatever efforts the racists of Pretoria make to suppress the struggle of the peoples, the Namibian people will certainly fulfil their legitimate aspirations. In their long and just struggle, the Namibian and other African peoples have had, and will continue to have, the support and solidarity of all revolutionary, progressive and peace-loving peoples all over the world. They also have the full support of the Albanian people, who have continuously and categorically opposed and exposed the various imperialist manoeuvres to delay Namibia's independence.

297. In conclusion, the delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania wishes once again to reiterate that the Albanian people and their Government will continue strongly to condemn the colonial policy of the racist régime of Pretoria towards Namibia. We are convinced that, through their determined struggle, the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, will destroy all the attacks, plots and intrigues of the racists of South Africa, imperialism and world reactionism and will achieve their full and genuine freedom, independence and sovereignty.

298. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): More than 18 years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), on 27 October 1966, by which it terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. By resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory as the sole, legal authority and to guide the people of Namibia towards achieving full independence.

299. In the face of the arrogant defiance of that and subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly by the racist colonialist régime of South Africa, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Jus-

tice was sought with a view to verifying whether or not the United Nations was legally and politically authorized to assume direct responsibility for the Territory by terminating South Africa's Mandate, which had been conferred upon it by the League of Nations. In its Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971,[5] the International Court of Justice stated, in no ambiguous terms, that the decisions taken by the General Assembly in the adoption of resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) were in full conformity with the principles of the international legal system.

300. Over the years since then, the Security Council and the General Assembly have adopted scores of resolutions calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal by South Africa of its colonial administration and armed forces of occupation from Namibian territory.

301. In order to put an end to the depletion of Namibia's rich natural resources by the colonial Power and the capitalist transnational monopolies, the United Nations Council for Namibia enacted, on 27 September 1974, Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[2]

302. Faced with the stubborn refusal of the *apartheid* régime to abide by the United Nations resolutions, the Security Council adopted resolutions 418 (1977) and 473 (1980), imposing military sanctions against South Africa. Yet no meaningful and tangible step could be taken towards the implementation of those resolutions which could bring closer the attainment of independence by Namibians. South Africa's colonial administration and armed forces still remain in Namibia; extensive economic and military assistance from imperialist countries continues to be rendered to the *apartheid* régime; oppression and suppression of the Namibian people continue to increase; and the plundering of Namibian natural and human resources by the colonial authorities and capitalist transnational monopolies continues to drain Namibia of whatever still remains in that unfortunate land. And what causes great concern is that the international community seems to have no foreseeable chance of putting an immediate end to this shameful and deplorable situation.

303. Obviously, the key party which is responsible for the continuation of the present situation in Namibia is the abhorrent racist régime of South Africa, which, relying on the use of brute force and repression within Namibia and piratical acts of aggression and intimidation against the front-line States, is out to perpetuate its colonial hold over Namibia. That could not however mislead the international community into ignoring some detrimental factors which are at work and which exist not in Namibia or in South Africa but in the United States and some other imperialist countries.

304. Further evidence continues to surface proving beyond any reasonable doubt repeated violations of relevant United Nations resolutions, as well as of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, by some of the very same countries that voted in favour of those resolutions.

305. The decision of the European Community to extend economic assistance to the occupying Power in Namibia and the IMF loan of over $1 billion to the racist régime of South Africa have not only failed to help the overwhelming majority of South Africans and Namibians but ultimately resulted in the diversion of greater resources by the South African racist clique for further arming of the oppressive, warmongering machine of *apartheid*.

306. This is evident from the fact that the Pretoria régime has increased its military expenditure in the 1984-1985 budget by 21.4 per cent to a total sum of more than $3 billion.

307. Apart from huge quantities of military and other related items acquired from certain imperialist countries and the Zionist régime of Israel, the South African racist, colonialist régime has been able, with the co-operation of its allies, to establish a large network of military industries.

308. There are persistent reports of the existence of secret military and security arrangements between the Government of South Africa and some States Members of the United Nations and of plans to establish a south Atlantic treaty organization, with the participation of the Pretoria régime, to defend imperialist interests in the southern hemisphere. Of serious and great concern are also the sufficiently credible reports on South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability and its continuing plans for producing and perfecting chemical and biological (bacteriological) weapons. Should those reports prove to be consistent with reality, the threat posed by the racist régime of South Africa to the security of the whole area would acquire a new and far-reaching dimension, which would inevitably result in the sharp deterioration of the international security climate.

309. There is no doubt that those plans could not have materialized had it not been for the diplomatic, economic and military collaboration extended to the racist régime by some imperialist States, at the top of the list the United States, which is engaged in its shameless and treacherous policy of so-called constructive engagement with the racist régime. It is no wonder that the outlawed régime finds it possible to confront the overwhelming majority of mankind in total defiance of the verdict of the international community.

310. The arrogant disregard of international public opinion by the racist Pretoria régime thus has its roots not only in the criminal, horrific nature of the *apartheid* system but also in the policy of those that have practically identified themselves with the perpetrators of that system, namely, the United States and some of its imperialist allies.

311. If the present ominous trend continues unchecked, the international community will ultimately have to face a situation in which the achievement of a settlement will be far less possible than it may appear to be today.

312. There are certain elements which lie at the core of the present situation in Namibia. I wish to underline these elements.

313. First, the question of Namibia is, in the complete sense of the word, a decolonization problem. As such, the issue of Namibia is an issue between the people of Namibia, represented by SWAPO, and the international community, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, on the one hand, and the racist régime of South Africa as the occupying Power, on the other. To try to explain this issue in the context of East-West confrontation would be a futile effort aimed at undermining the total applicability to Namibia of the principle of the right of all nations to self-determination and independence.

314. Secondly, on the basis of the Definition of Aggression contained in resolution 3314 (XXIX), adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1974, the continued occupation of Namibia by South African forces constitutes a clear act of aggression. The people of Namibia are thus entitled to wage all forms of struggle, including armed struggle, to rid their territory of the occupation forces. At the same time, all patriotic elements captured by the racist occupying Power in the course of this struggle must therefore enjoy the status of prisoners of war, in conformity with the Additional Protocol[10] to the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War[11] of 1949.

315. Thirdly, SWAPO is the sole, legitimate and authentic representative of the people of Namibia and the vanguard of their struggle for total independence. Thus any attempt to win recognition and legitimacy for the subservient puppet local authorities in Windhoek totally violates provisions of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

316. Fourthly, resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the only basis for the settlement of the Namibian problem. Any attempt by the so-called Western contact group or from any other quarter to qualify, modify or amend that resolution or to introduce into it extraneous and irrelevant issues of so-called linkage, parallelism or reciprocity constitutes a grave violation of that resolution. The designs of the United States and South Africa to tie the Namibian settlement to the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist contingent from Angola is therefore in total defiance of that resolution and is aimed at delaying the achievement of a solution to the problem.

317. Fifthly, the United Nations Council for Namibia is the sole legal Administering Authority for Namibia. Therefore, any attempt to deny the authority of the United Nations as the inheritor of the League of Nations in order to alter the legal status of the Territory or to portray the issue as a territorial or regional issue runs counter to the international legal system and provisions of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

318. Sixthly, under Security Council resolution 432 (1978) and General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978, the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia unquestionably includes Walvis Bay and the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands. Any attempt to separate those areas from mainland Namibia are thus illegal, and null and void.

319. Seventhly, since the Government of South Africa has consistently defied the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and by doing so has violated the obligations it assumed under the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council can and must, in our view, impose without any further delay comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against that Government under Chapter VII of the Charter and set a timetable for implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

320. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan believes that the international community should allow no further time for the dilatory tactics of the racist régime of South Africa and its imperialist collaborators. All forms of assistance and co-operation should be extended to SWAPO, to the African National Congress of South Africa and to the front-line States with a view to enabling them to intensify their struggle against the colonial rule of South Africa in Namibia, to eradicate the inhuman *apartheid* system in South Africa and to defend their territories against the repeated acts of aggression and destabilization perpetrated by that régime.

321. In conclusion, we wish to put on record our gratitude to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the untiring efforts they are making on behalf of the international community to achieve early independence for Namibia and its people.

322. Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): When the Security Council unanimously adopted its resolution 435 (1978), it held out so much hope. The Council had not only reached agreement on a major issue of international concern—independence for Namibia—but it also had succeeded in endorsing a comprehensive plan for its implementation. SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia, and South Africa, which illegally held the Territory, had within the ambit of that resolution reached common ground. For the long-suffering people of Namibia, resolution 435 held out the promise of freedom and justice and the seemingly early prospect of joining the international community as a fully independent State. For the United Nations itself, the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) seemed to be a happy fulfilment of its unique role as the Organization held directly responsible for Namibia. Even the strongest critics of the United Nations conceded that it had indeed achieved a signal success. The resolution was hailed by the OAU, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Commonwealth and other organizations as a genuine victory in which everyone seemed to be a victor.

323. It is indeed a rare occurrence in multilateral negotiations when accord is reached on the settlement of a major problem that has assailed the conscience of the international community. Resolution 435 (1978) was one such. It has since become the universally acknowledged corner-stone on which the future independence of Namibia has to be built. There is therefore no other foundation of which the international community can avail itself in the task of setting on its feet a nation that has long been struggling to exercise its right to self-determination and to establish its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

324. Tragically, the promise held out by resolution 435 (1978) soon turned sour when South Africa reneged on its earlier acceptance of that historic resolution. Thereafter, the course of true independence for Namibia has never run smoothly. The fate of resolution 435 (1978) in the period after its adoption and the dubious negotiations South Africa has had on Namibia are well known to the Assembly.

325. As the Assembly takes up the question this year, the position on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) seems rather clouded and it is not clear exactly how, at what speed and on what basis it will be eventually implemented.

326. We must not permit South Africa to circumvent the United Nations. Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until such time as an act of self-determination has been exercised and national independence attained in the Territory. The United Nations Council for Namibia is the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, and we would like to express our appreciation for the work done by the Council in monitoring developments in the

Territory and in keeping the question of Namibia in correct perspective before the international community. We thank the President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, and other members of the Council for their continuing vigilance.

327. South Africa has continued illegally to hold Namibia through the ruthless exercise of force in a vain attempt to stall what seems inevitable: the independence of Namibia. Numerous stratagems have been employed to delay, if not deny, independence and to extract as much advantage as possible from Namibia to serve South Africa's interests.

328. Attempts have been made, for example, to skirt the United Nations peace plan for Namibia by promoting fraudulent "internal settlements" and by plans to establish a so-called State Council, with the object of drafting a so-called Constitution. The intention is not to hasten progress towards independence, nor to develop and foster self-government in Namibia, but rather to consolidate South Africa's grip on the Territory through the foisting of political institutions and organizations beholden, and therefore subservient, to white minority interests. Sri Lanka has firmly rejected the so-called linkage approach whereby Namibia's independence is held hostage to extraneous issues, such as the Cuban presence in Angola, which is a question of which Cuba and Angola are seized.

329. Efforts at dismembering Namibia should also be rejected. Namibia's accession to independence must be within its full territorial area, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands.

330. The natural resources of Namibia, which are the birthright of the people of Namibia, should be preserved against exploitation and depletion by South Africa in violation of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971[5] and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[2] As in *apartheid* South Africa, so also in Namibia, the régime has forced severely oppressive conditions on Namibian labour and has denied them even the right to organize trade unions. The huge profits raked in by the *apartheid* régime from Namibia starkly contrast with the wages and working conditions of black labour.

331. Against all this and against the machinations of South Africa, SWAPO has united opposition to racist control of Namibia and has continued its struggle to bring independence to Namibia. SWAPO has exhibited tremendous patience and maturity and has given the peaceful approach to independence through negotiations more than a fair chance to work. South Africa itself has made several feints in the diplomatic field and has pursued a predominantly military approach against the people of Namibia. Those who exhort SWAPO to eschew armed struggle should address themselves also to South Africa and use their considerable pressure to compel South Africa to respect the Security Council and honour its commitments *vis-à-vis* resolution 435 (1978).

332. The record of South Africa's military and police authorities in Namibia is no less brutal than its record within South Africa itself. It is the sheer force of arms that enables the *apartheid* régime to linger in Namibia. What the régime has perfected in South Africa is ruthlessly deployed against Namibia. Force cannot forever hold back the indomitable will of the people of Namibia; it can at most only manage a temporary restraint.

333. For the international community there is a clear choice: we can either take genuine steps to implement resolution 435 (1978) without delay in its entirety, unconditionally in its form agreed to by all concerned, or, in the alternative, we can let the situation drift, permitting the clouding of resolution 435 (1978) with all manner of extraneous pre-conditions which will not only delay justice and independence for Namibia but also court dangers that we all will be forced to regret. Rather than allowing the present deadlocked situation to run its endless course, it is the view of my delegation that to resolve this problem and bring it to finality, the international community must once again exert its collective political will to make possible the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

334. The entire international community must support the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to bring a just and lasting solution to the Namibian question within the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

335. Mr. AMEEN (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Next year we shall be commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, with which the United Nations expressed the hopes of the international community of seeing all peoples in the world enjoy their natural rights to freedom and independence.

336. Despite the progress achieved in the elimination of colonialism through the accession of most peoples throughout the world to independence and acceptance by the colonial countries of the *fait accompli* produced by the wave of emancipation that had shaken Africa, Asia and Latin America, the racist régime of South Africa continues to be intransigent, obstinately opposing the trend of history and the peoples' will in order to maintain its complete domination over southern Africa, and especially over Namibia.

337. In 1984, 100 years will have elapsed since the proclamation by the Berlin Conference that established the division of the African continent into various colonial countries. Throughout those many years, the heroic people of Namibia have been suffering under the yoke of persecution and colonialism of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa.

338. Despite the many decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the interest of the international community at every level, official and unofficial, that *apartheid* régime continues obstinately to defy the international community by its illegal occupation of Namibia, which is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of agreements and of international law and represents a major obstacle in the way of peace, security and justice in Africa and throughout the world.

339. The maintenance by South Africa of its illegal occupation of Namibia and its persistence in depriving the people of the Territory of their fundamental human rights by resorting to a policy of repression and violence against the helpless, defenceless people of Namibia, together with its acts of aggression against independent African States, have created a crisis inside Namibia and in the African continent

and represent a serious threat to international peace and security.

340. The Pretoria régime, with its practices and its determination to maintain its domination over the heroic people of Namibia, seeks through questionable manoeuvres and tactics to create political blocs, in its pay, in order to give its domination an appearance of legality. That régime resorts to all kinds of means, including strengthening its military presence in Namibia, imposing compulsory military service and creating tribal armed forces, to stir up civil strife, divide the population and perpetuate underdevelopment.

341. This policy practised by South Africa, which is devoid of humanitarian principle and morality and characterized by intolerance, reaction and hatred, is based on the use of force and the law of the jungle to justify its existence as a political entity for as long as possible—an existence which, however, can only be very short historically.

342. We are not at all surprised to see that régime, with the assistance of a similar régime, seeking to create huge military bases and sparing no effort to acquire nuclear capability—not to preserve the essence of that inhuman entity but to continue to persecute and torture the people of Namibia and to sow terror and instability in all of struggling Africa.

343. That régime has transformed the territory of Namibia into a fortress. In 1981 its military and police forces numbered more than 100,000. Since 1982, more than 80 per cent of the population of Namibia has been living in areas which are under martial law. The proclamation of a state of emergency has become customary throughout the Territory.

344. It is the duty of the international community, and the United Nations in particular, to denounce all those that co-operate with that régime. We must all condemn the close co-operation that exists between the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes in all spheres—political, economic, military, nuclear and so on—because that special kind of collaboration helps the Pretoria régime and strengthens its position internationally. For the Pretoria régime, that collaboration is a source of weapons and technology with which to continue its occupation of Namibia and attack neighbouring African countries while defying the international community and violating fundamental human rights. I refer representatives to the special report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* of 1983,[12] which speaks of the close co-operation between the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes in all areas, but especially in the technological and nuclear-weapons fields.

345. The recent visit of the South African Head of State to the occupied Arab territories (Palestine) gives clear proof of that collaboration and the sustained co-operation between the two racist régimes.

346. The value of the weapons and military equipment exported by Israel to South Africa amounted, in 1982, to approximately $2 billion. These exports encompass all kinds of weapons and offensive military equipment, enabling the racist régime to impose its domination and its will on Namibia while ensuring its military superiority as compared with neighbouring African countries.

347. The Symposium on a Century of Heroic Struggle by the Namibian People against Colonialism, held in New York from 31 October to 2 November 1984, clearly demonstrated that the South African régime has become one of the top 10 producers of weapons. South Africa collaborates continuously with the Zionist entity to develop its nuclear capability. The South African régime has developed its military capacity not to defend itself but to acquire offensive force for aggression and war against national liberation movements and independent African States.

348. The natural and human resources of the territory are being plundered by South African economic interests and Western interests and transnational corporations operating in Namibia. They are trying to exploit those resources as quickly as possible and to delay the independence of Namibia so that by the time it accedes to independence those resources will be exhausted. This is a flagrant violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

349. Western and Israeli monopolies which exploit the uranium, diamond and other mines in Namibia are of fundamental importance in the process of the total exploitation of the resources of that colonized territory. Those enterprises and transnational corporations have an influence in the major Western countries and seek to prevent the accession of Namibia to freedom and independence.

350. The intransigence and obstinacy of the South African régime, its rejection of General Assembly resolutions, especially resolution 1514 (XV), and Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), its mobilization of large military forces in Namibia and the continuation of acts of aggression against Namibia and neighbouring African territories are such that it is necessary for the United Nations to reaffirm its legal responsibility *vis-à-vis* Namibia through the United Nations Council for Namibia, while awaiting the accession of that country to national independence after having broken the yoke of domination.

351. My delegation supports the activities and decisions of the United Nations in regional and international conferences and symposia which have proclaimed support for and solidarity with the Namibian people, given their importance for national liberation and for the mobilization of international public opinion against colonialism, racism and zionism and for greater awareness of violations of human rights in the Territory and of the domination of the peoples in Namibia and Palestine.

352. We believe that it is necessary to intensify all efforts aimed at implementing United Nations resolutions and isolating the South African régime in order to enable the Namibian people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

353. For our part, we believe that the question of Namibia falls within the context of decolonization and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That is why we believe that any attempt at considering the question of Namibia within the framework of bloc rivalry or as a political manoeuvre complicates the issue and hampers the search for the just and equitable solution that should be found to the question of Namibia.

354. The only valid solution consists in putting an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South

Africa, ensuring the withdrawal of South African troops, releasing all Namibian militants, restoring all Namibian territory, including the offshore islands and Walvis Bay, to the indigenous population and guaranteeing the exercise without restriction of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, recognized by the United Nations and by the OAU.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[3] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16237.

[4] See A/40/87, resolution AHG/Res.125 (XX).

[5] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

[6] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24*, part two, chap. III, sect. B.

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15943.

[8] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 24*, part two, chap. VIII, sect. B, paras. 637 and 645.

[9] *Ibid.*, para. 640.

[10] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1125, No. 17512.

[11] *Ibid.*, vol. 75, No. 972.

[12] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 22 A*.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

82nd
PLENARY MEETING
Monday, 3 December 1984, at 10.55 a.m.
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. AL-MUSFIR (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is now 38 years since the question of Namibia was first placed on the agenda of the General Assembly at its first session in 1946. It is 18 years since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), on 27 October 1966, which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, proclaimed the continued occupation of that Territory by the racist Government of Pretoria illegal and made the Territory the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

2. Since that date this question has received increasing international attention and several international conferences have been held on the matter, the most recent being the Conference of Arab Solidarity with the Struggle for Liberation in Southern Africa, which was held in Tunis from 7 to 9 August 1984, under the auspices of the League of Arab States and the United Nations.

3. Several Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and declarations adopted at the conclusion of international conferences on the question of Namibia have recognized the total legitimacy of the cause of independence for Namibia and have condemned the racist régime of Pretoria for its continued occupation of the Territory and its failure to respect the international will.

4. Today we are meeting after yet another year of occupation. The Territory of Namibia is still under the occupation of European conquerors. The Namibian people are the victims daily of persecution, torture, expulsions and harassment by the racist forces in their own country, Namibia, and beyond. The entire region has been disrupted by these conquerors. The natural resources of the Territory are being plundered systematically and illegally. On the basis of colonialist ideology, monopolies are systematically and unlawfully plundering the national resources of the Territory. Labour is being exploited and paid ridiculously low wages, as indicated in a working paper [*see A/AC.109/744, para. 10*], according to which the per capita income of the indigenous black man is 125 rand, which is below subsistence level, whereas the per capita income of the white European is 3,000 rand—a ratio of 24 to 1. That proportion is outrageous on the part of those who claim to be defending democracy.

5. Genuine democracy protects the human being against exploitation, protects human rights and curbs monopolies. But the monopolies in South Africa and Namibia expel the true owners of the land of the country and the African workers when they ask for decent wages and for an improvement in their social conditions.

6. In the military sphere, the racist Pretoria Government—like the Zionist Government that is occupying Palestine—is, with the help of its allies in the industrialized countries, obtaining the most sophisticated weapons of mass destruction. Similarly, nuclear co-operation between South Africa and the Zionist State, on the one hand, and certain great Powers, on the other, has become very close, despite the embargo imposed long ago on the supply of weapons to South Africa, under Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

7. The question of Namibia is a colonial question and must be examined in that context. To examine it not in that context but in the context of East-West relations is tantamount to changing the very nature of the question. It can only increase the difficulties that are already hampering the establishment of peace and security in southern Africa.

8. Attempts at a so-called internal settlement and the alleged constitutional reforms cannot put an end to this tragedy. To do so we must respond to the aspirations of the Namibian people as expressed repeatedly and in various forums by the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Furthermore, the United Nations plan for the liberation of Namibia, as endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), adopted on 29 September 1978, must be put into effect. The Namibian people, through their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, have announced that they fully approve this resolution as well as other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

9. The Government of South Africa and its Western allies are imposing a further condition on the granting of independence to Namibia—that is, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. That constitutes interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign, independent State. We categorically reject any interference in the domestic affairs of any State.

10. On the 29th of November of this year, we heard a message from the President of the People's Republic of Angola in which he outlined the measures to be taken for the independence of Namibia, as well as the framework for the presence of Cuban forces and the conditions for their withdrawal. These proposals have been transmitted to the United Nations, to the racist, Fascist Government of South Africa and to the Government of the United States of America. Will this plan and these proposals, which could result in the independence of Namibia and the establishment of peace and security in southern Africa, be put into effect?

11. We are awaiting with impatience the day when the United States will play its natural role *vis-à-vis* the oppressed peoples whose territories have been usurped, whether in Namibia, in South Africa or in Palestine occupied by the Zionist, racist State of Israel. Its role, as a world force, is to aid the oppressed peoples to return to their homelands, from which they have been driven out. This applies to the Palestinian people, who must be helped to establish their own independent State. The occupiers must be forced to withdraw from Palestine, from South Africa and from Namibia and to return whence they came. We state to those who claim that they are defending human rights that these are global rights, because a human being is a human being whether he is in Africa, in Latin America or in the Middle East. Therefore, human rights cannot be differentiated according to region. To do so results in racial discrimination, which has been prohibited both under international law and under the Charter of the United Nations.

12. The United Arab Emirates once again expresses its complete solidarity with SWAPO in its struggle to achieve the total independence of the Namibian people and the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and the other offshore islands. We express our gratitude to the neighbouring countries that have been supplying moral and material support to SWAPO, the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We condemn acts of aggression against these countries, committed by any State whatever, as well as any interference in their domestic affairs.

13. In conclusion, my delegation expresses its sincere appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia and to Mr. Paul Lusaka, its President, for the efforts they have made. Through the President, we also express our thanks to the members of the Council and to its secretariat for the information they have supplied and the work they are continuing to do with such devotion. We express our gratitude also to the Secretary-General for the role he has been playing in the attempts to achieve the independence of Namibia as soon as possible.

14. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Eighteen years ago the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and called on the racist Pretoria régime to withdraw forthwith from the Territory of Namibia. Since 1966 the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted a large number of resolutions reaffirming that request and, at the same time, condemning South Africa for its persistent refusal to implement United Nations resolutions, for having introduced in and imposed on Namibia the inhuman system of *apartheid*, for its shameless colonial exploitation of that country's human and natural resources, and for the cruel colonial oppression to which it has subjected the Namibian people. The international community during all this time has constantly expressed its deep concern at the continued attempts by South Africa and its allies to place obstacles in the path charted by the United Nations for the realization of the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

15. Notwithstanding the indefatigable efforts of the international community to achieve an immediate and unconditional solution to the Namibian problem on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions, including Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which endorse the United Nations plan for the granting of independence to Namibia, the maneouvres of the racist South Africans to prevent the implementation of those resolutions have not ceased.

16. If the South African racists dare so arrogantly to oppose the decisions of the world Organization and to flout openly the expressed will of the international community, it is because they enjoy the wide protection, co-operation and political, economic, financial and military support of their allies, in particular the United States of America and Israel. This is so because Pretoria has subordinated the question of the independence of Namibia to the geo-strategic interests of American imperialism. All of this has led to a heightening of tension in the region, with deplorable consequences for all neighbouring independent States, and thereby for the whole world.

17. As a result of that policy, known as "constructive engagement", the South African racists pursue their open colonial war against the Namibian people, continue to occupy one part of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, and pursue their operations aimed at destablizing sovereign neighbouring States, while cruelly stifling the legitimate protests of the majority of the population. Despite the general and total condemnation of that policy, the South African racists continue to apply it. They still make persistent efforts to take the solution of the question of Namibia out of the United Nations framework.

18. As can be clearly seen from the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24*], it is in keeping with this policy that the United States and South Africa constantly bring up the issues of "linkage", "parallelism" and "reciprocity" in connection with the settlement of the Namibian question. They have gone so far as to establish as a precondition the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, despite the position stated by the People's Republic of Angola that such a linkage has no relevance to the matter of the immediate cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Republic of South Africa. The inconsistency in these efforts at linkage, aimed at delaying the settlement of the question of Namibia, became even more obvious in the substance of resolutions on Namibia adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council. General Assembly resolution 38/36 B, in a clear and strong manner, emphasizes that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the sole resolution which establishes the basis for the settlement of the Namibian question and that it must be applied without delay and without conditions by South Africa, with no qualifications, modifications or amendments of any kind.

19. The efforts of the international community in favour of the achievement of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, go hand in hand with the armed struggle of the Namibian people, under the guidance of their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, against the colonial oppressor for the achievement of this sacred right. The difficult conditions in which the Namibian people live under the inhuman system of *apartheid,* instituted by the racists, will not force them to stop fighting. The cruel racist practices and actions cannot break the will of a people firmly committed to the achievement of its inalienable rights. Notwithstanding continued threats of repression, the ranks of the Namibian freedom fighters, struggling for freedom, are constantly increasing.

20. The racists, in order to guarantee their continued exploitation of human and natural resources in Namibia for the benefit of foreign economic interests, which are imposed illegally in that Territory, and also to continue the war of aggression against the Namibian people, continually strengthen their military potential, increasing the number of occupation troops, which have already exceeded 100,000 men with all their weaponry.

21. Taking also into account the facts stated in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, namely that the racist régime continues to develop its military industrial capacity and its nuclear co-operation with the United States, some Western countries and Israel, it is necessary for the Security Council to abide by the proposals of the General Assembly and the United Nations Council for Namibia and to decide on mandatory global sanctions against the South African régime, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and the cessation of all co-operation with that racist régime. Thus, a very important contribution will be made to eliminating the growing threat to peace and security of the peoples of that region of Africa and the world, resulting from the policy of the South African racists.

22. This year the international community commemorated the one-hundredth anniversary of the heroic struggle of the Namibian people. Under the aegis of this anniversary, it will pursue its efforts in support of the just and legitimate struggle of those people for self-determination, freedom and independence. May we express our profound appreciation of the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under your skilful guidance, Mr. President, has made untiring efforts with a view to ensuring the implementation of United Nations decisions on the just and durable settlement of the Namibian question.

23. In its capacity as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, as in the past, will continue to give its unreserved support to the realization of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

24. On the occasion of the commemoration this year of Namibia Day, the Secretary-General of the Communist Party and President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Mr. Todor Zhivkov, addressed a message to the President of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Sam Nujoma, wherein he stated Bulgaria's position of principle on the question of Namibia. He stated the following:

> "The People's Republic of Bulgaria has always been in the forefront of the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and *apartheid,* and has always given its full support to the struggle of the Namibian people for the realization of their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence. We consider that the decisions of the United Nations, and in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), constitute the sole basis on which the independence of Namibia can and should be carried out without prior conditions. The People's Republic of Bulgaria strongly condemns the assistance rendered by imperialistic circles, in particular the United States, to the inhuman system of *apartheid* in South Africa. We also reject all the political manoeuvres to which the United States and South Africa resort to maintain the *status quo* in South Africa and to impose a neo-colonialist settlement for the Namibian question."

25. Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait): Kuwait attaches great importance to the current debate on the question of Namibia, during which the international community is demonstrating its concern for peace and justice. Among the positive results of this international concern is the release of the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, after 16 years of incarceration. We warmly welcome him to our midst as a free man.

26. The debate is not only a demonstration of concern but also an expression of responsibility towards the Namibian people. Namibia remains a primary responsibility of the United Nations. It remains an issue of decolonization of a Territory under illegal occupation by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

27. The international community has repeatedly called for the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the transfer of power to the Namibian people. The process towards this objective was laboriously worked out in a settlement plan, culminating in the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution remains, in the view of my delegation, the basis for a peaceful settlement. Deviation from its provisions could only be at the expense and to the detriment of the Namibian people. While emphasizing the commitment to the settlement plan, the international community has been witnessing the introduction of other issues into its framework, chief among which is "linkage". It is, then, not without concern that the international community has rejected the injection of extraneous issues into the settlement plan. Security Council resolution 539 (1983) clearly identified the so-called linkage issue as being incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, as well as resolution 1514 (XV).

28. While underlining its support for a peaceful settlement of the problem, the international community remains seized of a situation fraught with threats to international peace and security. On the political level, we are confronted with a party that has made intransigence and procrastination a corner-stone of its policy. It has proved ingenious in its delaying tactics designed to evade implementation of the settlement plan. On the economic level, the *apartheid*

régime and other foreign economic interests have been steadily exploiting, depleting and plundering the natural resources of Namibia. On the military level, that régime has often resorted to intimidation, aggression, political intervention and economic destabilization of neighbouring States. In Namibia itself, we are faced with a process of intimidation, repression and increased militarization. The latest manifestation of the policies of the South African régime is the recent imposition of military conscription of all male Namibians between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve in the occupying army, in a dangerous attempt to pit brothers against each other.

29. The sacrifices made by the Namibian people and the front-line States as a result of these policies have been staggering. Their resilience has been remarkable. While trying to overcome their difficulties, the Governments of the front-line States and SWAPO have demonstrated an admirable degree of statesmanship. They continue to bear with patience all attempts to derail the implementation of the settlement plan.

30. Needless to say, the international community has often deplored the policies of the *apartheid* régime and the support rendered to it by its allies. These policies should be rejected rather than tolerated. The *apartheid* régime should be isolated rather than embraced through policies such as that of so-called constructive engagement. The international community is called upon to adopt, and should apply, effective measures to control the situation. Such measures are not beyond its reach. We believe that, with serious pursuit of these measures and with co-operation among States, the international community could achieve the desired results, given the political will to do so.

31. The application of effective control measures is one way of assisting the Namibian people in their struggle for freedom. Another way lies in extending financial and technical assistance to their cause. The role played by the United Nations Council for Namibia towards this end has been indispensable. We pay tribute to its tireless efforts. Kuwait, for its part, will continue to support these efforts through the United Nations and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

32. We believe that peoples derive strength, in their struggle for freedom and independence, from collective support and assistance. We hope that our debate will be an asset in that respect.

33. Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): The General Assembly is once again considering the question of Namibia. Another year has passed, but we find ourselves in no way nearer the dawn of Namibian independence. At the outset, therefore, I should like to reaffirm the total solidarity of the Government and people of Bangladesh with the valiant people of Namibia in their just and legitimate struggle for freedom and national independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their true and authentic representative.

34. We have before us several reports on this item for our deliberations: namely, the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24*], the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*A/39/23*] and the report of the Fourth Committee [*A/39/675*]. We also have before us the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/508*] on this subject. May I record our deep appreciation to him for his untiring and commendable efforts in the cause of the Namibian people.

35. My delegation also wishes to commend you, Mr. President, for the admirable and exemplary manner in which you have guided the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia as its President. Let us hope and strive for the liberation of the Namibian people from the yoke of the abhorrent racist régime during your presidency of the General Assembly.

36. Bangladesh's position on the question of Namibia is firmly based on our total commitment to support for the oppressed peoples around the world waging a just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. It is also based on our deep and abiding faith in the Charter of the United Nations and our unswerving adherence to the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence. We are equally convinced that the process of decolonization is irreversible and the struggle for freedom and independence inexorable.

37. Our position on the question of Namibia may be summed up on the basis of the following points.

38. First, Bangladesh has reiterated its total and unflinching solidarity with and support for the people of Namibia in their just and legitimate struggle, by every available means, for freedom and national independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their true and authentic representative.

39. Second, we strongly condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa in defiance of United Nations resolutions and decisions and have reiterated time and again that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until genuine independence is achieved by the Territory.

40. Third, Bangladesh is firmly convinced that the independence of Namibia can and must be achieved in accordance with the principles embodied in United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which constitute the only acceptable basis for the peaceful transition of the Territory from colonial subjugation to independence, and has repeatedly called for their immediate and full implementation without any modification whatsoever.

41. Fourth, we have rejected all attempts by the racist Pretoria régime to link the independence of Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant issues. Similarly, we have rejected the racist régime's continued and repeated attempts to impose an internal settlement in Namibia.

42. Fifth, Bangladesh commends the leadership of SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, for extending its full co-operation towards the implementation of the United Nations plan, including its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement with the racist régime to facilitate the arrival of UNTAG, which would in turn set in motion the election process in Namibia under United Nations supervision.

43. Sixth, Bangladesh has repeatedly declared that Walvis Bay and the Penguin and other offshore islands are integral parts of Namibia and that the

territorial integrity and unity of Namibia must be preserved.

44. Seventh, we have strongly condemned the *apartheid* régime's military aggression against neighbouring African countries and its use of Namibian territory as a springboard for launching those attacks, as well as for other actions aimed at destabilizing those countries.

45. Eighth, we commend the leaders of the front-line States for the courage and fortitude they have shown and the invaluable support they have extended to the cause of Namibia.

46. Ninth, Bangladesh has reaffirmed its full support for the arms embargo imposed against South Africa under Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and has called for its full and effective implementation.

47. Tenth, Bangladesh has also strongly denounced the continued illegal exploitation of Namibian uranium and other resources by the illegal South African régime and foreign economic interests, in violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and decisions and, in particular, of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

48. Eleventh, Bangladesh, since its independence, has maintained no relations whatsoever with the racist régime in any field—diplomatic, political, economic, trade, social, sport, cultural or other—and we have consistently supported the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

49. Twelfth, within its modest means Bangladesh has contributed to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and has offered training facilities in Bangladesh for Namibian students.

50. Bangladesh is proud of its association with Namibia. We deeply value the trust and confidence reposed in us for assisting and facilitating the work of the United Nations Special Representative in the context of UNTAG. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Bangladesh has made and will continue to make every possible effort for the advancement of the cause of Namibian independence.

51. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to say a special word of appreciation for the efforts exerted by the Secretary-General towards the early independence of Namibia. We are fully aware of his deep personal commitment to this question and appreciate his intensive ongoing consultations with all the parties concerned with a view to the early implementation of the United Nations plan. During the course of the past year the Secretary-General has visited the region and made yet another effort at a comprehensive settlement of the problem. His efforts, as on previous occasions, have been blocked again by the racist Pretoria régime putting forward its totally unjustified and irrational pre-conditions.

52. Preceding speakers have already given a graphic account of the situation prevailing in and around Namibia. I would just like to point out that for over a decade and a half Namibia has been a unique responsibility of the United Nations. The international community, therefore, has the historic mandate to protect the rights and interests of Namibia until its independence. We cannot remain silent spectators of all the inhuman crimes being perpetrated by the Pretoria régime and the endless travail and trauma suffered by the Namibian people. The arrogant and obstructionist policies of the *apartheid* régime must be challenged effectively, and we must act decisively and firmly to usher in the independence of Namibia on the basis of the United Nations plan, the only acceptable and viable basis for a final and lasting settlement of the Namibian problem.

53. In conclusion, I would like to reaffirm our firm conviction that the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and national independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, their true authentic representative, will be crowned with success. Their struggle is just and its triumph inevitable.

54. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): One hundred years have passed since the night of colonial bondage descended on Namibia, a night which continues to this day. The liberation of that country from oppression by the South African racists has become one of the principal tasks in the present stage of the struggle to eradicate colonialism.

55. In spite of United Nations demands for the unconditional liberation of Namibia, the rulers of the Republic of South Africa have for many years subjected the Namibian people to cruel terror and repression, and are striving to break its will for freedom and independence. The racist régime of Pretoria has applied the inhuman system of *apartheid* to Namibia and converted the Territory into a raw-materials adjunct of the South African economy. At the same time, the Republic of South Africa is using the territory of Namibia as a bridgehead for aggressive and subversive activities against neighbouring States, which have justifiably come to be called front-line States.

56. As emphasized in General Assembly resolutions, South Africa's continuing illegal colonial occupation of Namibia, in violation of numerous United Nations decisions, constitutes an act of aggression against the people of Namibia.

57. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which fully supports the just struggle of the Namibian people against the occupiers, firmly advocates that the Namibian people be given the earliest possible opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in a single, territorially integrated State, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. It is in favour of the transfer of full power to the people of Namibia, through SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] to be the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

58. The international community, the United Nations, the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries are making systematic efforts to bring about the cessation of the unlawful occupation of Namibia. We should like to refer here to the great work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia under your leadership, Mr. President. The Council has done a great deal to defend the interests of the Namibian people, provide assistance in their just struggle for independence and mobilize public opinion in favour of the speedy solution of the Namibian problem.

59. The United Nations bears direct responsibility for the fate of Namibia and for its decolonization. The relevant decisions of the United Nations, in

particular, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), set out the practical ways and means to ensure the transition of Namibia to independent and separate development.

60. Yet the Pretoria régime, flagrantly violating the Charter of the United Nations and challenging the overwhelming majority of the States of the world, is doing everything possible to drag out endlessly the process leading to the solution of the Namibian problem so as to force upon Namibia, through a so-called internal settlement, a neo-colonialist system by which authority would be handed over to South African puppets and the position of the Republic of South Africa in that country would be preserved.

61. In this connection, Pretoria is being assisted in various ways by its imperialist protectors, most notably the United States of America. Everybody knows that the United States and certain other Western countries are pursuing their own selfish interests in Namibia. We see in Namibia the high-handed methods of imperialist transnational corporations, which are plundering the great mineral wealth and deriving excessive profits from the cruel exploitation of Namibians. Hundreds of millions of dollars are deposited annually in the coffers of foreign transnational and national companies.

62. The documents of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and other bodies of the United Nations contain a wealth of data which reveal the rapacious looting of the natural resources of Namibia. The logical conclusion to be drawn is that such unlawful activity by foreign economic, financial and other interests is one of the main obstacles to the attainment of independence by Namibia.

63. Furthermore, the American imperialists have handed over to the South African régime the function of policeman in protecting the "vital interests" of the United States in the southern portion of the African continent. It is no accident that Washington considers the racist régime of Pretoria to be its "strategic ally". This is what lies at the heart of the "constructive engagement" between the United States and South Africa.

64. Through their joint efforts Washington and Pretoria are torpedoing every attempt by the United Nations, the front-line States and SWAPO to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. The overseas strategists are assisting the captains of the racist régime in their manoeuvres and advising them how to "link" the granting of independence to Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant questions, so as to place insuperable barriers in the way of a settlement of the Namibian problem and limit Angola's sovereign right of self-defence in circumstances of constant military aggression by the Republic of South Africa. A recent letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa addressed to the Secretary-General is evidence of the fact that the Pretoria régime continues to try to force such "linkage," although it has been condemned and rejected in United Nations decisions, by the OAU and also by the heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

65. Thus, the attempts of the United States and the Republic of South Africa to substitute for genuine Namibian freedom and independence a neo-colonialist variant and the extensive assistance to South Africa provided by the United States, certain other Western countries and Israel in the political, economic, military and nuclear spheres are the basic reasons why United Nations resolutions on Namibia have so far not been implemented.

66. In firmly condemning the racist régime of South Africa, which, with the encouragement of its imperialist allies, is continuing to hold the Namibian people in a state of colonial slavery by force of arms, the Ukrainian SSR fully supports the demands of the African States concerning the speedy adoption by the Security Council of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the Republic of South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We are firmly convinced that only through the joint efforts of all States, through the total isolation and boycotting of the racists in the international arena, will it be possible to achieve the early liquidation of the last bastion of colonialism in southern Africa and to strengthen peace and security in that region.

67. In accordance with its position of principle, the Ukrainian SSR will continue in the future to speak out in support of the struggle of the courageous Namibian people, headed by SWAPO, for its freedom and liberation. We affirm our solidarity with the peoples of the African front-line States and support their efforts to reach a just settlement of the question of Namibia in accordance with United Nations decisions.

68. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is considering the question of Namibia at a very critical juncture in the history of the conflict imposed by the white racist minority régime on the southern African region as a whole. A few days ago the General Assembly discussed carefully and fully the deteriorating conditions of the South African people resulting from the intensified application of the shameful policy of *apartheid* of the Pretoria régime, which is applied both institutionally and constitutionally against the dignity, rights and interests of some 80 per cent of the population of South Africa and against every non-white person. Thanks to these debates, in which most Member States have participated, it has become clear that the Pretoria régime is committing four international crimes, simultaneously and persistently, against the peoples of southern Africa. These are: first, the crime of collective enslavement, which is perpetrated inside South Africa through the policy of *apartheid;* secondly, the crime of continuing the occupation of Namibia, which is a crime against the right of people to independence on the one hand and against peace on the other; thirdly, the crime of continued aggression against the front-line States; and, fourthly, the crime of actions and manoeuvres by the Government of Pretoria to destabilize the African States in southern Africa, as well as the policy of blackmail directed against those States in order to strengthen South Africa's hegemony over the Africans, in collusion with world imperialism.

Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

69. Contrary to the claims from some Western quarters, it seems that on the question of Namibia a departure is traditionally made from the major concepts and provisions of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions which, as is well known, provide for the immediate indepen-

dence of Namibia. The most important of these resolutions is Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. It seems that there exists a dangerous attempt at deviation designed to undermine international legality through a set of imperialistic policies and conspiracies based on two parallel, simultaneous plans. The first plan is being carried out against the peoples of southern Africa under the misleading slogan of "constructive engagement". This "constructive engagement" concept was invented by the United States of America, in collusion with Pretoria, in order to make it possible to intervene in the affairs of the region, to impose its hegemony there and to continue the policies of aggression and racial discrimination in southern Africa, disregarding any international responsibilities, especially those under the United Nations and its Charter. The second plan is related to the question of linking the independence of Namibia with the imposition on Angola of a set of conditions that run counter to the sovereignty of Angola—a country that achieved its freedom and independence through long struggle and heavy sacrifices. This linkage is in fact encroachment upon the independence of Angola and intervention in its internal and external affairs in an attempt to perpetuate South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

70. On the basis of these considerations, in its discussion of the question of Namibia the General Assembly faces an extremely difficult task, namely, to confront all these plans designed to maintain the old *status quo* and destabilize the African States in southern Africa.

71. World imperialism is currently using all its influence to amend and alter the concepts, purposes and provisions of resolution 435 (1978). Amending that resolution is but a stage in an overall scheme to do away with the international legality that came into existence as a result of international solidarity and the struggle of the people of Namibia. Recently, Namibia's independence was in sight; today, it seems far away. Therefore, the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia and other international governmental and non-governmental organizations should redouble their efforts to frustrate this conspiracy against international legality, as embodied in resolution 435 (1978), and in order to abort all deviationist and regressive tendencies.

72. Mr. Sam Nujoma, the President of the South West Africa People's Organization, last June reminded us of this danger when he said: "Much of the recent flurry of activities and meetings inspired by Pretoria have been mere delaying tactics aimed at finding alternatives to the United Nations independence plan for Namibia, which provides for elections that SWAPO is confident of winning hands down".[*]

73. This danger is real. We can feel it daily through the repeated attempts being made not only to undermine the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia pursuant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but also to remove the question of Namibia from the framework of the United Nations. This means the isolation of SWAPO and its being dealt with unilaterally, which would result in delaying the independence of Namibia and in fragmenting international solidarity.

74. The threats, pressures and sanctions exercised against the States committed to supporting the people of Namibia with all possible means in its struggle for independence are proof of the attempt to undermine our collective efforts to bring about this independence. Therefore, the General Assembly should take all effective measures to ensure the implementation of its previous resolutions and those adopted by other United Nations bodies, by the OAU and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

75. We are confident that the attempts to disrupt international solidarity against colonialism, racism and foreign occupation through methods contrary to the Charter, including political blackmail, at a time when the spectre of famine and deprivation looms over millions of Africans, will fail.

76. Our solidarity with Africa in general and with the people of Namibia in particular is not the result of immediate interests. This consideration emanates from our full commitment to the liquidation of imperialism and colonialism wherever they may be, in accordance with the Charter and with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), wherein we have all committed ourselves to the eradication of all forms of colonialism and foreign domination. These threats do not frighten us; on the contrary, their only effect is to broaden our front against those who wish us to keep silent about the crimes being perpetrated against the people of Namibia and the other peoples of southern Africa.

77. In fact, these threats have backfired, for the General Assembly, in its resolution 38/36 B, reaffirmed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. The General Assembly also demanded the immediate and unconditional implementation of that resolution without qualification, modification or amendment or the introduction of extraneous and irrelevant issues of "linkage", "parallelism" or "reciprocity" insisted upon by the United States of America and South Africa. The General Assembly requested the Security Council to exercise its authority with regard to the implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 532 (1983) so as to bring about the independence of Namibia without further delay. Moreover, the General Assembly urged the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to ensure the total cessation of all co-operation with that régime.

78. Another principled response came in the form of the Final Communiqué of the Summit Meeting of the Front-line States, held at Arusha on 29 April 1984,[2] in which the heads of State or Government reaffirmed their total and unqualified commitment to the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia against colonialism under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative. They also called for the rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and reiterated the importance of the continuing role of the Secretary-General and the Security Council in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. They also rejected linking the freedom of Namibia with any decision taken by the Government of Angola regarding its security needs and internal political structure.

---

[*] Quoted in English by the speaker.

79. On the basis of the principle of Arab-African solidarity and co-operation, which emanates from ties of brotherhood and the history of a common struggle against all forms of imperialism, the Conference of Arab Solidarity with the Struggle for Liberation in Southern Africa, held at Tunis from 7 to 9 August 1984 with the co-operation of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the League of Arab States, drew attention in particular to the policy adopted by the United States of America, which has damaged the vital interests of Africa and the Arab world by its strategic co-operation with Israel and its policy of constructive engagement with Pretoria. That Conference condemned all attempts to divide the Arab and African States in their common struggle to liberate Africa, Namibia and Palestine. It also strongly condemned the close alliance between the two racist régimes, in Pretoria and Tel Aviv, in view of their common hostility to the freedom of the African and Arab peoples. It welcomed the oil embargo imposed by the Arab countries against South Africa. The Conference also condemned the support and encouragement provided by some Western countries and Israel to the *apartheid* régime.

80. My delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for their very detailed respective reports [*A/39/24 and A/39/23*], both of which show the true dimensions of the conspiracy hatched against the independence of Namibia and international efforts to ensure that independence. The reports mention possible ways of supporting the struggle of the Namibian people against the racist occupation, under the leadership of SWAPO, and of overcoming the obstacles blocking the path to independence.

81. It is clear that the United States, some Western countries and Israel bear direct responsibility for the deterioration of the situation in Namibia because of their increased co-operation with the racist régime. It is clear from the above-mentioned reports and from other reports that the deteriorating conditions in southern Africa also are the responsibility of certain States. For example, in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia it is stated that "the mandatory arms embargo was not successful in stopping the flow of foreign arms to South Africa" [*see A/39/24, para. 196*] because of the continued nuclear collaboration with the *apartheid* régime by the United States and some other Western countries and Israel.

82. The same report states that "the development of South Africa's nuclear capability has been enhanced and accelerated by the collaboration extended to the *apartheid* régime at various levels by certain Western States, particularly the United States, and by Israel, through assistance in uranium extraction and processing the supply of nuclear equipment, the transfer of technology, the provision of training and the exchange of scientists" [*ibid., para. 233*].

83. Therefore, Israel, which speaks often about the assistance it provides to some African States from the pocket of the American taxpayer, bears a special responsibility for the continued occupation of Namibia, as a result of its collusion with the Pretoria régime at all levels.

84. The same report also asserts that Israel is the primary supplier of weapons to South Africa and that "Israeli officials themselves have acknowledged that South Africa was the leading recipient of Israeli arms" [*ibid., para. 229*].

85. The alliance between Pretoria and Tel Aviv against the interests of southern Africa is an alliance of a special type, based on a common ideology and similar practices, which are inspired by the racist and colonialist nature of their régimes. Therefore, this is not an alliance of two parties against another party, but an alliance which should be seen in the context of the larger strategic alliance between Washington and Tel Aviv, on the one hand, and Washington and Pretoria on the other. This tripartite alliance threatens the security of the Middle East and the African continent because of the aggressive actions taken against the peoples of these regions. It is no secret that Washington is doing its utmost to enhance these two bases of colonialism and imperialism in South Africa and Palestine to extend its hegemony to two of the most important regions of the world, namely, the Middle East and Africa, since they contain enormous economic and natural resources and because of their strategic importance. The accelerating pace of this tripartite alliance threatens international peace and security, especially since the increasingly militaristic tendency of the United States runs parallel with similar aggressive militaristic tendencies in the two racist régimes, which use force in their approach to development and in their daily life, and as an objective in itself.

86. Therefore, if the Assembly wants to halt the aggression of *apartheid* against Namibia, it has to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without delay, while at the same time imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Moreover, boycott measures against South Africa should be applied in a very strict manner, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions and with resolutions adopted in other forums. We also have to do our utmost to help the struggle of SWAPO in all areas, especially through armed struggle, for the liberation of Namibia. All these measures should be taken simultaneously, because we will not be able to compel the *apartheid* régime fully to withdraw its forces from the land of Namibia unless the African and national struggles gain increasing international support with intensified international pressure on the *apartheid* régime to eliminate imperialism from Namibia.

87. My country is not afraid of the threats made by those in imperialist circles in order to prevent us from speaking our minds when we are discussing problems related to imperialism. For us, decolonization is a duty and a commitment. The present facts should encourage us to adopt more resolutions in order to improve international action, and to extend more assistance to the people of Namibia and SWAPO, as well as to the threatened African States.

88. In our view, responsibility for the continued failure to implement United Nations resolutions falls squarely on some Western States, in particular the United States and Israel. It is a crime to be silent and it is also a crime to attempt to hide the identity of the culprit. We shall spare no effort in extending all possible assistance to the Namibian people and SWAPO in their efforts to attain independence in a unified Namibia.

89. We are convinced that our struggle against Zionism is a way of contributing to the struggle against *apartheid*, which is the other face of colonialism, supported by imperialism. The terrorists are those who resist and suppress the aspirations of peoples to freedom, independence, equality and justice.

90. Mr. FOSSEN (Norway): Since we last debated this question one year ago there has been little evidence of any progress being made towards finding a solution to the Namibian problem. The aspirations of the Namibian people to independence and self-determination remain unfulfilled, and we understand their feelings of frustration and anger. The question of Namibia constitutes a major challenge to the United Nations and we all have an obligation to contribute to the achievement of independence for Namibia. It is long overdue.

91. Much thought and effort have gone into planning for Namibia's future. Through the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), we have a comprehensive plan for achieving such independence. This plan has been accepted by the international community and the parties most directly concerned. It remains the only framework for an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem.

92. We all know that there are other issues holding up the independence of Namibia. The South African Government has demanded the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a condition for implementing resolution 435 (1978). Although we recognize that this undoubtedly is an important issue to which a solution will have to be found, my Government considers that it should not be allowed to delay the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

93. My Government continues to believe that every effort should be made to achieve a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem in order to stop further bloodshed and suffering. We were therefore encouraged by the so-called Lusaka agreement in February of this year regarding the withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola and the establishment of a joint South African-Angolan monitoring commission to supervise the withdrawal process. We had hoped that this agreement could help create a climate of confidence in the region and thus facilitate the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. I regret to say that these expectations have not been fulfilled. South African troops are still in southern Angola.

94. My Government has noted with satisfaction the efforts being made by the United States to unblock the current stalemate in the Namibian negotiations. We have been encouraged by the constructive attitude taken by the Angolan Government in this connection and we hope that the South African Government will respond in a similar fashion. However, the recent letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa to the Secretary-General on the question of Namibia does not give cause for any optimism in this respect. At the same time, I should like to stress that nothing should be done to undermine the vital role of the United Nations in achieving the independence of Namibia and that the Secretary-General should be closely involved in the negotiation process.

95. Norway remains committed to early achievement of independence for Namibia, and my Government has made significant contributions to the various United Nations activities benefiting Namibia. Let me mention the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. We also give considerable humanitarian support to SWAPO for the benefit of Namibian refugees, and my Government has recently decided to finance the construction of a secondary technical school for Namibian refugees in the People's Republic of the Congo. My Government is also prepared to assist in the reconstruction and development of a free and independent Namibia.

96. In our statement under this agenda item at the 75th meeting of the thirty-eighth session we stated our disappointment and frustration at the unacceptable language contained in many of the draft resolutions on the situation in Namibia submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. I regret to say that we have the same reservations with regard to the draft resolutions submitted by the Council this year. My delegation will comment in more detail on these draft resolutions later on, but I should like at this stage to express my reservation about the work programme being presented by the Council. My Government feels that, as the United Nations authority responsible for Namibia, the Council should direct its activities towards preparing in a practical way for Namibia's independence. Yet the Council seems to direct too much of its attention and resources to the holding of seminars and symposia of limited practical benefit. We should like to see a reversal of this unfortunate trend so that the United Nations Council for Namibia may be able to play a more constructive role in the future.

97. The continued South African occupation of Namibia has brought great suffering upon the people of Namibia. The Namibian economy has suffered from many years of warfare and drought. The South African Government must surely know that it is fighting a losing battle. My Government would hope that the South African Government would draw the logical conclusion from this and agree to the early implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

98. Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros) (*interpretation from French*): On the eve of the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we deem it appropriate to point out the lessons that can be learned from the question of Namibia.

99. The decolonization of Namibia is unquestionably the responsibility of the United Nations. It is in that spirit that we interpret General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted by the General Assembly in 1966, which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and the establishment, in 1967, of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

100. The advisory opinion delivered by the International Court of Justice in 1971[3] described South Africa's presence in Namibia as illegal, considering it devoid of any juridical foundation. Finally, in 1978 the supreme organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, adopted resolution 435 (1978) and endorsed the plan of action to enable the Namibian people fully to enjoy their inalienable right to independence.

101. Resolution 435 (1978) and the resolutions related to it provide the ways and means for settling this painful question peacefully. We nourished great and real hopes when the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978). But with the passing of time, given the intransigence of the South African Government, those hopes have given way to despair and bitterness. In fact, the continued South African presence in Namibian territory and South Africa's obstruction of the implementation of the plan of action for the decolonization of Namibia are, in our opinion, a challenge flung at the international community in general and Africa in particular.

102. It is therefore appropriate to wonder about the true scope and political impact of the resolutions we adopt each year on the various problems threatening peace and thereby jeopardizing the development and well-being of the peoples we represent here. It is because the credibility of the United Nations is at stake that my delegation solemnly requests the countries friendly to South Africa to use their influence to induce it to change its position, for the benefit of the Namibian people. These people have suffered too much from brutal, blind repression, from the continued exile of their sons. Their claims are simple and legitimate. They aspire only to peace and the enjoyment of their most fundamental rights. SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, has constantly given proof of good faith, political maturity and wisdom in the search for a just and lasting solution to this question.

103. Unfortunately, SWAPO's readiness and the international community's determination to complete the work of the decolonization of Namibia are confronted by the negative, nefarious attitude of the racist South African régime.

104. South Africa, instead of abiding by the various resolutions adopted by the United Nations on this subject, goes on inventing delaying tactics and subterfuges of all kinds to curb the process of the decolonization of Namibia. Everyone here remembers that this year South Africa purely and simply torpedoed the talks which were held with SWAPO in Zambia and Cape Verde for the purpose of speeding up Namibia's independence.

105. The racist Pretoria régime continues to link the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) with extraneous elements, in particular the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. For my delegation, the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola can in no circumstances be a pre-condition for the decolonization of Namibia. Angola, a sovereign and independent country, is free to appeal to any country for assistance in ensuring its national security. For the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, the insistence on this notorious linkage is an inadmissible pretext for delaying the liberation of Namibia.

106. The Namibian people have made enormous sacrifices, and there is an urgent need to ensure that right prevails over might. These people await from all of us the most valuable birthday gift of their history, on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations—that is, their inalienable right to self-determination.

107. In conclusion, my delegation ventures to hope that the enthusiasm and firm positions demonstrated in the Assembly will be followed by concrete deeds in support of the courageous Namibian people in their historic struggle for national liberation.

108. The decolonization of Namibia is an integral part of an irreversible movement for the exercise by all peoples of their inalienable right to decide their own destiny.

109. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): It is with a deep feeling of frustration that my delegation embarks upon the consideration of the question of Namibia, which for a number of years now has been at the very heart of the concerns of the international community, confronted as it is by the combined efforts of the backward forces of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* to halt the course of history by continuing to deny the Namibian people the enjoyment of their legitimate rights to self-determination, freedom and independence.

110. This criminal policy of the Pretoria régime is being pursued in spite of many General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which have repeatedly called on South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibian territory. Ignoring international public opinion, South Africa has met United Nations action with defiance, strengthening its military potential and increasing, on the one hand, its repression within its own borders and in Namibia and, on the other, the destabilization of neighbouring States, which are thereby compelled to conclude with South Africa agreements designed not only to isolate the freedom fighters but also to perpetuate South Africa's racist hegemony over the southern part of the African continent.

111. At the same time, Pretoria is actively engaged in an intensive propaganda campaign which gives the false impression that it is prepared to co-operate in the search for a negotiated settlement to the Namibian problem. These manoeuvres of the racist régime should not astonish anyone. Using cunning, pretending to negotiate, now feigning to yield in order later to reopen the whole issue, Pretoria is only trying to gain time for the purpose of consolidating its position. Experience has shown that it is resolved to use terror and violence to achieve its purpose.

112. Today, Namibia is a huge armed camp, with one soldier for every 12 adult members of the population. The current status is practically that of martial law, which permits the murdering of innocent civilians, arbitrary arrests and detention, torture, and so on, in order to maintain the *status quo*.

113. One can never emphasize sufficiently the urgent need to bring about a negotiated solution which would put an end to the prolonged sufferings of the Namibian people while at the same time having a positive effect upon security and stability within the region. Six years have passed since the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which is universally recognized as the only basis for a peaceful and authentic settlement of this question.

114. As is well known, contrary to the will to co-operate clearly manifested by SWAPO, which went so far as to propose a cease-fire, Pretoria has unfortunately done everything to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

115. Among the difficulties raised was, in the first instance, the question of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Is there any need to recall in this connection that the right of a people to independence, once recognized, cannot be made dependent upon any other right or condition? Is it also necessary to emphasize that this linkage is one of the most

astonishing paradoxes of contemporary international life, according to which the cessation of the illegality of the occupation by South Africa of Namibia should depend upon the cessation of a fact which is legal and legitimate from all standpoints? Only upside down logic would make it possible to understand such a position.

116. Be that as it may, Pretoria is going to leave Namibia sooner or later. Those which, by their actions, support it are contributing to providing it the time needed for the elimination of the SWAPO leadership and the establishment of a puppet régime in Namibia. Under these circumstances, we cannot but deplore the attitude of those States, especially those that have special obligations under the Charter of the United Nations but yet encourage South Africa to torpedo the United Nations plan for Namibia and to perpetuate its unlawful occupation.

117. There is no doubt that the situation in southern Africa in general, and specifically in Namibia, is a serious threat to international peace and security. As such, it justifies the implementation of enforcement measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the effective and immediate application of which by all Member States would compel South Africa to bow to the will of the international community. The situation also requires that SWAPO be strengthened and provided with the material and moral support it needs in order to enable it to confront the occupier successfully in the struggle which was imposed upon it.

118. For its part, the Republic of Haiti, which has always been at the forefront of the struggle of peoples against colonialism, foreign occupation, racism and *apartheid*, reaffirms its unstinting support for the valiant people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic and legitimate representative. It remains confident that, current circumstances notwithstanding, this struggle, which is also its own, will soon be crowned with success.

119. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The continuation of the South African occupation of Namibia is a flagrant challenge to the authority of the United Nations and the Security Council. Moreover, Namibia is suffering from the maximum distortions of a colonial economy and the ravages of the *apartheid* system perpetrated in Namibia for over two decades. The people of Namibia are deprived of human rights and fundamental freedoms—civil, political, economic, social and cultural. South Africa has subjected them to increasing physical and spiritual repression. The occupying Power has not hesitated to deplete the rich natural resources of Namibia, whether in the mining industry, agriculture or fishing.

120. I wish to reiterate my Government's high esteem for the continuing dedication of the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, to the cause of the people of Namibia. The report of the Council again this year gives an accurate description of the dismal situation in and around Namibia. This portrayal consists of persistent, widespread violations of human rights, such as the detention of individuals without charge for indefinite periods and the use of torture.

121. The basis for negotiations and a political solution is embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The focal point of the United Nations settlement plan is free and fair elections, signifying an unfettered democratic expression of the will of the people. My Government strongly believes in and supports a negotiated settlement. These past years have clearly indicated that it is not internationally acceptable to impose any pre-conditions on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) or otherwise to delay the attainment of Namibian independence. The international community must intensify its efforts to convince the South African Government of this fact and to accelerate the implementation of the United Nations plan. It is worth bearing in mind that the Government of South Africa has committed itself to that plan.

122. The people of Finland have a history of friendly relations with the Namibian people going back for more than a century. Responding to a need of the highest priority among the Namibians, the need for education and training, Finland's initiatives and proposals have led to the founding of the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. Our continuing dedication to the cause of the people of Namibia is manifested in our annual contributions to these funds and programmes. Our country also gives humanitarian assistance to SWAPO and to Namibians, both directly and through the United Nations. We have declared that independent Namibia will become a major recipient of Finnish technical and economic assistance.

123. Our action has been motivated solely by a desire to make a constructive and pragmatic contribution to the settlement of the Namibian question. We have maintained our preparedness to participate in UNTAG in order to be able to respond promptly and efficiently to any request for services.

124. Additionally, we emphasize the assistance rendered by the programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which is targeted for the agricultural and training sectors. Its primary aim is to help the Namibians living outside their country, in refugee camps, to improve their standard of living by giving them the means to become more self-reliant, thus lessening their dependence on international aid and making them better prepared for the future development of Namibia.

125. The wider regional security issues affecting Namibia's peaceful accession to independence, which have been the subject of recent initiatives aimed at putting an end to armed conflict and building up confidence in the area, deserve to be carefully studied. It should be determined to what extent these could advance the foundation of an independent Namibia. It is of the utmost importance to break the impasse that has prevailed during the past few years. We thus welcome the new and concrete approaches presented in recent discussions by relevant parties to the conflict. We should recognize especially the constructive position of Angola in this context. We should also pay a tribute to the statesmanship and valuable initiatives of the front-line States, in particular Zambia, which, together with Cape Verde, has provided good offices to the parties. SWAPO, showing remarkable patience, has played a crucial and positive role in the search for a peaceful, negotiated settlement. We recognize SWAPO as having an essential role in endeavours to achieve a political solution in Namibia.

126. It is the common responsibility of the States Members of the United Nations to be of assistance in

the search for a settlement and to see to it that any arrangement for Namibian independence will be based on the provisions set out by the international community in the United Nations plan and Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

127. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Never has a decolonization problem proved as disconcerting as that of Namibia. For several decades, while South Africa has been called upon to respect its international obligations with regard to Namibia, it is still ignoring such calls. Analysis of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council shows beyond doubt that for far too long its aggression has persisted against the Namibian people and that international peace and security are seriously endangered in the region because of Pretoria's actions.

128. In the course of its frequent deliberations on the Namibian question, the General Assembly has amassed a great deal of damning information concerning the racist Pretoria régime. The continued illegal occupation of that Territory, the successive attempts to subvert the process of its decolonization, the repeated destabilizing and aggressive actions against sovereign States of the region and the strengthening of the *apartheid* system show clearly the extent of the tragedy that is taking place in the southern part of the African continent.

129. Today, six years after the adoption of the plan for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, the situation has not changed. The implementation of the decolonization of Namibia stands at an impasse, and there South Africa and some of its allies wish to keep the efforts of the United Nations.

130. The question of Namibia is too well known by the General Assembly to require lengthy explanations. As a decolonization problem, it is among those which cannot be subject to any challenges or erroneous interpretations, because the essential facts cannot be misunderstood.

131. Eighteen years ago the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory of Namibia and undertook to bring to a conclusion the process of its liberation. Since then, in a joint effort, the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice and the Security Council have accurately defined the inevitable course for the restoration of right and the realization of the consensus of the nations: the independence of Namibia in full sovereignty and with complete territorial integrity.

132. South Africa's Mandate over Namibia has thus been annulled, and its presence in the Territory declared illegal. The inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence and the legitimacy of their struggle for national liberation under the direction of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, were confirmed.

133. Thus the independence of Namibia became the goal of all. By its resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), which reflected the international consensus and expressed a common will to hasten the decolonization of Namibia, the Security Council defined the necessary terms and conditions for providing and affirming the process leading to that goal. Since then, all the initiatives aimed at the implementation of that settlement plan have been blocked by South Africa. South Africa's responsibility for the failure of those initiatives, its persistence in its illegal occupation of Namibia, its successive attempts to subvert the process of the decolonization of that Territory and its destabilizing actions should have called for firmer action on the part of the international community.

134. Pretoria's intransigence and its delaying actions have been supported, it must be stated, by complacency and by powerful complicity. In defying the international consensus, the Government of Pretoria, comforted by the support it has received from certain Powers with which it maintains privileged relations, has constantly mobilized its political and military apparatus in order to impose a neo-colonialist solution upon Namibia.

135. The impasse at which the Namibian question now finds itself and the attempts to divert the process of its decolonization from the normal course laid down for it by the United Nations are a source of serious preoccupation for Africa and for the international community as a whole. The intrusion of an irrelevant link between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola has created further barriers to that process, which has been delayed for far too long. This link is contrary to the spirit and the letter of the United Nations settlement plan and vitiates all the accepted and recognized data on the question of Namibia. Obviously, this link between a State's sovereign decision and an authentic problem of decolonization on which international unanimity exists gravely jeopardizes the effort organized patiently and perseveringly by the community of nations. The decolonization of Namibia has thus been attacked at its core and diverted from its course by being viewed from the geostrategic standpoint and being thrust willy-nilly into the context of confrontational power relations.

136. This state of affairs only strengthens the attempt of the racist régime of Pretoria to impose an internal solution in Namibia. We cannot help wondering if an attempt is being made, by means of constantly deferred deadlines, to impose a neo-colonial solution on the Namibian people, against its will and contrary to its legitimate aspirations. That is why Africa, and subsequently the General Assembly and the Security Council, forcefully rejected the establishment of such a link.

137. At this decisive stage of the settlement of the Namibian question, it is essential to reaffirm vigorously both that SWAPO is the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people and that the United Nations bears the full and indivisible responsibility in Namibia's process towards independence in strict compliance with resolution 435 (1978). Given South Africa's equivocation and the intensification of its policy of oppression and aggression, the United Nations must translate into specific measures and actions its solidarity with the peoples of southern Africa in their struggle.

138. Because of its sole responsibility for Namibia's decolonization process, because of its legal authority over that Territory until independence, and because it is the guarantor of the maintenance of international peace and security, the United Nations must take the decisions needed to put an end to Pretoria's policy of defiance.

139. The problem of Namibia is and will continue to be a problem of decolonization. It is subject to action clearly identified by the United Nations and to a series of decisions which have universal support. These basic truths must be reaffirmed with all the

necessary vigour to protect the decolonization of Namibia against all attempts at modification. Therefore, it is the duty of the international community to support the Namibian people and their national liberation movement, SWAPO. It must show its solidarity by effective commitments and specific action.

140. As the Namibian people commemorate a century of struggle against colonial occupation, that duty becomes an obligation for the international community, which should make practical efforts to establish international legality in Namibia and enable the people of that Territory to enjoy all their inalienable rights.

141. I wish to conclude by paying a tribute, on behalf of my country, to the Namibian people's fight for national liberation and by reaffirming to their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, our unflagging solidarity and support. I wish also to hail the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in favour of the just cause of the Namibian people.

142. The PRESIDENT: I call now on the observer of the League of Arab States, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950.

143. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): Once again the General Assembly is seized of the question of Namibia. The world community is called upon to go beyond condemnation. Racists, when condemned, tend to treat world opinion with contempt. Racists become more intransigent. They tend to feel that those who initiate condemnation are denying racism its privilege of being superior and of acting accordingly. Those who support the initiators of condemnation are for the most part considered by the racists to be "opportunists" or "misguided", or racists who are cowardly and therefore disguise their racism. To racists—such as the practitioners of *apartheid*—exclusionary policies, practices and behaviour are inherent, necessary and an attribute of superiority. To sustain the abnormal, unnatural, immoral, illegitimate structures of racist régimes, resort to sophisticated mechanisms of repression is inevitable. Violence is a measure by which to exert force on those who confront discrimination and all forms of occupation and disfranchisement. Violence is latent in the plans to sustain the permanency of inequality and the efficacy of repression and occupation.

144. Racists resort to pseudo-legal measures to render their victims so bogged down in trivial involvements on a daily basis that they resign themselves to their fate and condition themselves to limiting their concerns to mere survival, acquiescing in the permanency of their humiliation and disfranchisement.

145. Racists do not recognize the humanity of their victims. In that way, their system and practices are dehumanized. To buy time, racists keep introducing new issues; they resort to procrastination; they defy United Nations resolutions; and they insult their critics in a deliberate attempt to remain immune from accountability. Diversionary tactics have become, as we all know, the habit and the method of the two remaining openly racist régimes, namely South Africa and Israel. Both throw tantrums in the United Nations. Both act hurt at even minor criticism by whomever they perceive as sponsors—that is, Western Europe and the United States. Both live in intellectual ghettos, as they are totally oblivious to the humanist, rational and egalitarian components of Western civilization, of which these two régimes claim to be projections in South Africa and the Middle East.

146. What both these régimes represent in fact is the last colonial-settler thrusts, at an historical juncture when decolonization has legitimized the equality of nations and peoples and the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination. Equality and self-determination, however, have always been considered by these régimes to be an intrusion into the overall conceptual scheme of racism and an interruption of what racists consider to be their absolute right to dominate others, to control their destiny and to keep them in a perpetual state of national exclusion.

147. From this vantage point, the racists—whether the *apartheid* régime in South Africa or the Zionist régime in Israel—consider any challenge to their control to be subversion, any resistance to their occupation terrorism, and any dissent or mild opposition to their practices seditious and perfidious. Because the remaining racists intend to perpetuate their absolute control over the destiny of others, they attribute their own basic characteristics to their opponents, and reverse the realities in an uncouth shamelessness that causes the human mind everywhere to boggle.

148. That is why the racists are indifferent to United Nations resolutions and contemptuous of those that favour them. This studied indifference and contempt is becoming a serious obstacle to effective action by the United Nations and a serious roadblock in the way of peace and freedom, not only in Namibia but throughout the continent of Africa.

149. The League of Arab States, aware of the grave danger of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia and its deliberate prevarication concerning compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), has demonstrated its unequivocal support for the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO.

150. We are aware that the South African *apartheid* régime dangles before certain sectors of the world public measures intended to confuse the growing international consensus on applying the necessary sanctions so that condemnation may achieve the necessary and desired results. Condemnation without penalty has ceased to be an incentive to racists to change and reverse their policies. It has emboldened South Africa—as it did Israel—to pursue its aggressive policies of occupation and repression and its inhuman, discriminatory practices and behaviour.

151. We in the League of Arab States, in fulfilling our moral and political commitments to the people of Namibia, undertook as a first step in our co-operation with the United Nations system a joint Conference of Arab Solidarity with the Struggle for Liberation in Southern Africa.

152. The Conference of Arab Solidarity with the Struggle for Liberation in Southern Africa, which was held at the Arab League headquarters at Tunis from 7 to 9 August 1984, in its declaration [*see A/39/450, annex*], besides condemning the illegal occupation of Namibia and the reckless exploitation of its human and natural resources, rejected any extraneous linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The Conference called for the provision of all the necessary

moral and material assistance to SWAPO in the struggle for genuine independence and freedom for Namibia, as endorsed repeatedly by the Council of the League of Arab States.

153. At this particular moment the international community, through its collective will, must demonstrate its determination, capability and effectiveness. For too long the peoples of Namibia and Palestine have awaited the results of "constructive engagements", whether they take the form of the Camp David accords or the form of the constructive engagement policy of the United States with the racist régime. How long are those engaged in such futile exercises willing to wait? It is time the United States and other Western Powers realized that their contribution to the liberation struggle of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa will also salvage the very values that the West claims to promote and cherish.

154. To apply double standards by permitting further delays and giving South Africa the opportunity to further circumvent General Assembly and Security Council resolutions will only allow the *apartheid*-Israeli axis to remain a threat to peace and international security. This must be avoided. I am sure that this debate will further enhance the necessary awareness and steel the will of the freedom fighters in Namibia and elsewhere.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[2] A/AC.115/L.611.

[3] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

83rd

PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 3 December 1984,

at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. TAHINDRO (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Namibia has been a matter of grave concern to the United Nations since its establishment. Despite its continuous efforts to include Namibia in the world of the second part of the twentieth century, in accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of peoples and their right to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the people of Namibia remain the victims of a colonial régime which stubbornly refuses to abide by the injunctions of the international community. Although there is a world consensus on condemnation of the illegal occupation of the Territory, South Africa has attempted to consolidate its grip by massive militarization of Namibia, pillaging its resources and treating its people brutally. Moreover, this shameful régime has continuously sought to impose puppet institutions on the local population, in violation of Security Council resolution 439 (1978) which declared any unilateral measures taken by the *apartheid* régime in relation to the electoral process and any institutions established as a result of such elections to be null and void.

2. South Africa, in collaboration with certain foreign interests, is shamelessly pillaging the natural resources of Namibia. In this context, it is not surprising that the Namibian economy has remained a colonial-type economy. A report of the United Nations Council for Namibia prepared for the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, demonstrates that that economy is divided into two sectors. The main sector includes the two most highly productive branches of activity, mining and commercial agriculture, and is located in the area reserved for the whites. That area takes up more than two thirds of the Territory. As for the African majority, it is parked in homelands in the north of the country, whose meagre agricultural resources are not sufficient to feed the population, and it is not authorized to leave those areas, under the *apartheid* system, except to act as cheap contract labour for white farmers.

3. If we study a breakdown of the gross domestic product in the Territory in per capita terms we note that this is one of the most inequitable systems of income distribution in the world. According to available figures, the per capita income of whites in 1980 was 3,000 rand approximately, whereas for the blacks as a whole the corresponding figure was 125 rand. This represents a 24 to 1 ratio.

4. Moreover, an analysis by sector demonstrates the unbalanced and precarious structure of the Namibian economy. The mining industry contributes approximately half of the gross domestic product, but uses only 10 per cent of the labour. Commercial agriculture provides a lucrative revenue to approximately 5,000 white exploiters, who own more than 95 per cent of commercialized agricultural production. Subsistence agriculture is almost the only economic activity reserved for the indigenous population and constitutes only 2.5 per cent of all the agricultural production placed on the market. Altogether, the agricultural sector contributes approximately 14 per cent of the gross domestic product and 20 per cent of exports. It can be noted in passing that there is overexploitation of fish resources and that this has contributed to impoverishment of the marine resources of the Territory. On the other hand, the mining sector represents approximately half of the gross domestic product and approximately 90 per cent of exports. Since South African and foreign interests operating in Namibia are focusing on mining in order to make quick profits, other sectors of the economy have been left to one side, leaving this potentially rich Territory dependent on imports to meet their most elementary needs.

Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

5. According to available information, it is generally estimated that South African forces in Namibia number approximately 100,000 men—in other words, approximately one soldier per 12 Namibians. To that figure must be added the territorial forces of South-West Africa/Namibia, the paramilitary and the police, including the "anti-riot forces", called the "permanent force", the "citizens' force", the "national service men". All these occupation forces are stationed in approximately 85 to 90 bases in Namibia.

6. Moreover, it has been established that South Africa, in violation of international treaties prohibiting the production and utilization of chemical and bacteriological weapons, is manufacturing such

weapons for use against the national liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia. In this context, a white South African conscientious objector stated to a United Nations *ad hoc* group of experts on 26 May 1983 that the *apartheid* régime was trying to develop biological weapons, called ethnic weapons, using carefully chosen viruses that would contaminate the black population only.

7. In view of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria, it is important to emphasize that the Namibian people, far from bowing their heads, have pursued their armed struggle under the guidance of the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], their sole authentic representative. The freedom fighters of the people's liberation army of Namibia have stepped up their armed struggle and inflicted important human and material losses on the occupation forces.

8. We are convinced that continuing armed struggle, with the unswerving support of the international community, is the only way for the Namibian people to regain their freedom.

9. We would like to express our appreciation to the United Nations and in particular the United Nations Council for Namibia for their tireless efforts to ensure that this Territory speedily achieves independence. We consider the Council to be the only Administrative Authority for Namibia and reject any solution that would envisage the prior elimination of SWAPO, which, because of its valiant struggle, has indeed become the sole representative of the Namibian people.

10. We are convinced that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. It is high time for South Africa to understand that the international community will accept no internal settlement which imposes a neo-colonialist solution. Similarly, it must understand that the international community will continue to reject any "link" or "parallel" between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola as obviously incompatible with the spirit and letter of resolution 435 (1978). South Africa must understand sooner or later that it is not by a blind rush forward, politically, by turning the conflict into a Namibian conflict, or by perpetrating armed acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States that it will be able to solve the problem of the decolonization of Namibia.

11. We are convinced that only the speedy exercise of self-determination by the Namibian people under the supervision of the United Nations, the dismantling of the *apartheid* system, the unconditional withdrawal of South African occupation forces from Namibian territory, the cessation of acts of aggression and destabilization, and the granting of material assistance to SWAPO and front-line States will make it possible to reduce tension in this area of Africa. We call upon all peoples that cherish peace and justice to support the victims of the barbaric régime of Pretoria, as called for in the Bangkok Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [*A/39/24, part two, chap. III, sect. B*] of May 1984.

12. For our part, we reaffirm once again our solidarity with the just cause of the Namibian people who are fighting for recognition of their fundamental inalienable rights and for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. Also, we solemnly reiterate our support for SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of this heroic and martyred people. We are convinced that Namibia will soon take its proper place within the international community. In this context, we should like to read out an extract from the message of the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, which was transmitted to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on the occasion of the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and Their Liberation Movement, SWAPO, as follows:

> "The Democratic Republic of Madagascar will always stand side by side with peoples struggling for their liberation, and it is with deep feeling that the Supreme Council of the Revolution, the Government and I offer the fraternal people of Namibia and SWAPO our sincere support and militant solidarity."

13. Finally, we should like to avail ourselves of this opportunity to reiterate our support for the United Nations Council for Namibia—over which you have the honour to preside, Mr. President—as the only legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its total independence.

14. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): For as long as the question of Namibia continues unresolved, it becomes increasingly instructive. It holds valuable lessons in explaining why States behave the way they do; what motivates them; the extent to which they believe in and are committed to principle and to the rule of law; and how far they are prepared to go in defence of the values they profess to uphold, particularly when they believe a national interest, whether real or otherwise, is at stake.

15. One aspect of the uniqueness of Namibia is that the framework for a settlement of this question already exists, unanimously adopted by the Security Council. I refer to the settlement plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This plan has even had the support of a potentially effective institution for its implementation, and here I refer to the Western contact group.

16. Six years have elapsed since the adoption of that resolution and the people of Namibia are no nearer the achievement of their goal. They have seen their right to freedom made a hostage of East-West Power politics, with their future linked to extraneous considerations relating to issues falling squarely within the purview of the sovereignty of an independent African State.

17. I am aware that this situation of stagnation has been causing a great deal of anguish to the Secretary-General. In addition to the aspect of human suffering and threat to peace and security, there is also that of the implications for the United Nations, which, since 1966, has had such a special relationship with the Territory of Namibia.

18. I should like here to pay a public tribute to the Secretary-General for his continuing personal devotion to the cause of Namibia's freedom in the face of South Africa's intransigence on the one hand and the collaboration and permissiveness of some Western States on the other.

19. Reflecting on the question of Namibia—as this debate provides an opportunity for so doing and indeed requires us to do—I am certain that members will agree that the pervasive feeling in the Assembly is one of having been let down. The international community had reposed faith in the ability, and

certainly the preparedness, of the contact group, acting on behalf and in support of the Security Council, to curb South Africa's intransigence and defiance and to ensure Namibia's freedom. Yet, looking back over the last six years, is it not South Africa that has been "calling the shots" over Namibia? And who knows what other devices may still be concealed in its repertoire in order to produce even more delay in Namibia's accession to freedom?

20. It pains us to confess it but in the struggle for liberation in southern Africa or elsewhere, clear, proper assessments are essential. Effectively, the Pretoria régime has been able so far to halt the march of decolonization in Africa at the northern border of Namibia; and the judgement of history will certainly be that it was allowed to do so by States which had the power to restrain it but chose not to do so.

21. To be sure, there was much contact group activity over the last six years. But what is clear, what has been clear throughout the period in question, is that Namibia's liberation has never fired the enthusiasm of these States. It has never truly stimulated a commitment on the part of these Governments to doing something decisive to bring about that freedom.

22. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I wish to be careful not to imply a lack of appreciation for the part which the Governments of these countries have otherwise been playing in support of Namibia's liberation. Their contributions, financial and otherwise, to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, and in other areas, have been generous and have made possible significant accomplishments in the areas of concern of these various activities. This is a matter of record. However, while it is noble to raise the comfort level and to contribute to the well-being and the edification of Namibians outside of Namibia, ten times more noble is it to help them to get the occupiers out of their home.

23. The Guyanese delegation has stated on many occasions that South Africa's occupation of Namibia has benefited from and been sustained by Western investments, Western permissiveness, Western passivity and Western vetoes, whether real or threatened. The basis of the partnership between the racist Pretoria régime and some Western States and their monopolies is well known.

24. The converging and interlocking political and economic interests are no less so: the Tsumeb Corporation, Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, Ltd., Rössing Uranium Ltd., among others, are the embodiments of imperialist plunder and exploitation in the Territory of Namibia. Such collaboration with the Pretoria régime represents an alliance with *apartheid*, an alliance which hurts the people of Namibia and prolongs their suffering. It is these interests—is it not?—which stand between certain Western Governments and a genuine commitment to bringing an end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

25. My concern now is not only out of humanitarian considerations. It springs also from considerations of legality, to which I know Western States are fond of expressing such profound adherence. And when I invoke legality I do not have in mind simply this or that resolution of the General Assembly or the Security Council. My concern is even more fundamental. It is that under contemporary international law colonial occupation is illegal; and people subjected to alien domination and exploitation have a right to self-determination. This right to self-determination even pre-dates the very creation of the Organization. It is here that we find the roots of what is the legal consensus on Namibia.

26. Permit me to quote the following few lines from a work of a dear and close friend of the Namibian cause, Professor Julio Faundez, Lecturer in Law at the University of Warwick:

> "The rejection of colonialism and the recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle for national independence stem from a generalized awareness that colonialism constitutes a denial of basic human rights, of essential political freedoms and of economic independence. This political awareness is today part of international law and is embodied in rules which provide that the fate of a territory should be determined by the people who live in it, that the protection of natural resources is an essential prerequisite in exercising political sovereignty and that the adoption of policies to perpetuate alien political domination constitutes a particularly serious violation of international law. It is these general principles and rules of international law that create binding obligations on all States to bring South Africa's occupation to an end, to take steps towards contributing to the self-determination process and to take effective measures to protect Namibia's natural resources".

27. My delegation calls on the Governments concerned to make a firm commitment to Namibia's freedom; to take a stand, once and for all, on the side of legality, on the side of the people of Namibia and the struggle for their liberation. With such a commitment by them, Namibia's freedom could not be far away.

28. Of course, by withholding their full support for the struggle of the people of Namibia these Governments are only delaying Namibia's freedom; they do not, they cannot, deny it. And this brings me to other lessons to be learned from the question of Namibia: the indestructible nature of the desire for freedom, the resilience of the human spirit and the extent of sacrifice which peoples are willing to endure for their freedom. Policies of terror, detention, torture and intimidation have done nothing to the people of Namibia, if not to make that flame of freedom burn even brighter within their hearts. The Pretoria régime has left them with practically no options; that is why the struggle will continue, and it will be victorious.

29. The General Assembly has a duty in the course of the current debate to identify practical ways of intensifying moral and material support for the efforts of the Namibian people. That struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, is the true expression of the striving of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. Support by the international community for SWAPO is part of the effort for the application of principles on which the United Nations is based. The Assembly should, on this occasion also, invite all States Members to extend increased and effective material, financial, political and diplomatic support to SWAPO.

30. At the same time, the international community must increase its support to the front-line States, which, because of the support which they render to the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia, must endure a never-ending wave of assaults by South

Africa against their sovereignty and territorial integrity, with the most injurious effects on their economic structures, and extensive loss of life and material damage.

31. Guyana has read carefully the communication of 29 November addressed to the Secretary-General by the President of the People's Republic of Angola, and we reiterate our support for and solidarity with the Government and people of Angola in their efforts to safeguard their sovereignty and territorial integrity. We also express our appreciation for Angola's commitment to ensuring Namibia's early liberation. As we in Guyana see it, Angola is fully entitled to make such arrangements as it considers appropriate for the defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

32. The essential counterpart of and complement to a concern with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola must be, it seems to my delegation, more effective action, by those feeling this concern, to restrain South Africa from its attacks against Angola and from rendering support to those bands which wish to destabilize and undermine the Government of Angola. The Pretoria régime must be made to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and must refrain from intervening in the Territory and from interfering in its internal affairs.

33. The Assembly must also strive to ensure that international action for the freedom of Namibia regains momentum. There must be an early return to the modalities of transferring power to the legitimate representatives of the people of Namibia. The Security Council must shoulder its responsibility to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

34. The United Nations Council for Namibia has been pointing the way for action by the international community in these respects. My delegation wishes to commend and express its appreciation for the leadership provided by Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia in this regard. In the face of indifference and even open hostility from certain quarters, the Council, under his guidance, has striven tirelessly and steadfastly in the fulfilment of its mandate. The year 1984 has been a year of solid achievement in the area of attracting and mobilizing support for the Namibian struggle; 1985 must be, and will be, a year of even greater action and achievement in response to the new challenges facing the United Nations in respect of Namibia and the evolving opportunities in the wider struggle. A priority area of action must, of course, be the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1984. The Council has ample evidence, among non-governmental organizations in Western Europe and the United States, of the most enthusiastic support for such action. We must make the best use of that enthusiasm and good will and proceed to give effect to the Decree which we enacted 10 years ago.

35. In 1985 we need to apply our creative energies, as never before, to Namibia's liberation. Through our joint efforts we must also identify areas of action for making a greater assertion of the authority of the Council and for giving more practical expression to the seriousness with which we take our responsibility as legal Administering Authority. Our first concern in this regard must certainly be resolution 435 (1978).

36. In all these aspects I have identified and in any programme of work that may be agreed upon for the Council, the commitment and dedication of the Government and delegation of Guyana remain secure.

37. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): Few problems have engaged the attention of the international community over the last 18 years as has the illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa. In the years since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of *apartheid* South Africa over Namibia numerous attempts to elaborate political arrangements for its peaceful transition to independence have been made. None, however, has engaged the international community more and generated more corresponding optimism than the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the Organization's plan for the independence of Namibia. The political and diplomatic activity which ensued and was sustained over a period of five years made necessary the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva in January 1981 and the proximity talks in 1982 here in New York. Indeed, we recall the sense of optimism which was generated by the positive pronouncements of the parties to those talks and in particular the concluding declaration of the proximity talks that, save for the system to be employed in the elections, all issues relating to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved.

38. Speaking on this item at the thirty-eighth session [*78th meeting*], my delegation expressed deep regret that the hopes which had accompanied the conclusion of those proximity talks and the reaching of the agreement on the framework for the commencement of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been frustrated by the introduction by the racist régime of new and irrelevant demands and by its predicating the independence of Namibia on their fulfilment. This regret was shared by the overwhelming number of delegations. Today, a year later, the refusal of the *apartheid* régime to allow the implementation of the plan persists. All efforts by the front-line States, by SWAPO, by the Secretary-General and by the United Nations as a whole to find a way out of the impasse have been frustrated by the consistent refusal of the *apartheid* régime to heed the demands of the international community.

39. While the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, an inherently aggressive régime, is opposed in principle to the independence of Namibia, no framework of a political relationship with any other country has done more, in its reinforcement of that aggressiveness and opposition, to undermine the international efforts to free Namibia than the so-called policy of constructive engagement. Put into effect four years ago, the policy, in a two-pronged strategy, has been instrumental in the elaboration of a political partnership which is mutually complementary. On the one hand, the *apartheid* régime sustains a political objective of constructive engagement in its insistence on linkage, and, on the other, it is rewarded by collaboration in all fields, as well as by general political protection. That collaboration has found concrete expression in the forging of closer diplomatic ties with the régime, as evidenced by the many exchange visits of high-level officials on both sides and the signing of a consular treaty.

40. *Apartheid* South Africa is the recipient of the most sophisticated armaments and delivery systems,

including technology and personnel, to assist in the development of the *apartheid* nuclear-weapon capability, in contravention of the arms embargo in force against that régime.

41. In the economic field, the certificate of political respectability accorded it by constructive engagement has paved the way for billions of dollars in new investments and loans, including those directly sponsored by the proponents of constructive engagement.

42. At the political level, constructive engagement has meant unfaltering consistency in support of the *apartheid* régime. Close identification with the preoccupations of *apartheid* on the diplomatic front by some of its allies, the frantic efforts to rehabilitate the régime, and the ready resort to the use of veto in the Security Council to protect it have emboldened it and sustained its defiance. Indeed, the Assembly remembers the way the *apartheid* régime flaunted that political support and protection when it contemptuously rejected Security Council resolution 539 (1983) in a letter dated 29 October 1983 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General.[2]

43. As it relates to linkage, the strategy is subsumed in making the independence of Namibia conditional upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In due course, however, it has become evident that these troops are being used to mask the deep-rooted political opposition of the *apartheid* régime and its allies to Namibia's independence, thereby protecting the multinational interests which have convergent desires to continue plundering the natural resources of Namibia. As an added incentive, the *apartheid* régime and its friends have succumbed to the temptation to use the presence of those troops to obtain a long-standing political objective against the People's Republic of Angola, which would otherwise not be attainable. As a result, resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented. It is linkage which stands in the way.

44. These consequences apart, the so-called constructive engagement violates the ruling of the International Court of Justice, which in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 stated:

> "States Members of the United Nations are under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia . . . and to refrain from any acts and in particular any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration."[3]

Indeed, linkage has facilitated continued occupation of Namibia.

45. We continue to regret that a party to the understandings reached at the conclusion of the proximity talks—the United States—has not only decided, largely on the basis of ill-conceived ideological considerations, to opt out of that consensus, but in fact turned around and decided to undermine those delicate arrangements. Since the invention of the so-called Cuban factor, new excuses in the form of numerous impossible demands on the People's Republic of Angola and SWAPO have been created. As a result, the door to Namibia's independence has been closed and the world is forced to await the satisfaction of political desires long held by the patrons of *apartheid*.

46. These tactics are not new. Politically, they embody the underlying opposition of the *apartheid* régime and its allies to independence for the Namibian people. From the point of view of strategy, they are reminiscent of the ludicrous claims of the intangible element of the so-called mutual trust and confidence or the so-called United Nations impartiality in the years preceding the proximity talks—these demands being of course aimed at thwarting the putting into place of arrangements for the independence of Namibia.

47. Linkage has been rejected and condemned by the international community as a whole. It has been rejected in its philosophy and application as it relates to the reinforcement of *apartheid*, to the sustenance of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States, in particular the continued occupation of Angola, and to the denial of the Namibian people's right to self-determination and independence. That rejection still stands. Africa, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the international community as a whole have reiterated that the issue of the presence of Cuban troops is not a problem and is without consequence to the decolonization process in Namibia. It is an artificial creation, conveniently given to racist South Africa to justify obstinate endeavours to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

48. Since the last session, as the international community has continued to grapple with the problem of Namibia, this position has been reiterated. The Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, as well as the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, also underlined the position. Both meetings reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence. In conformity with that fundamental consideration, both meetings rejected any attempt or manoeuvre to deny the Namibian people this right. In particular, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity reiterated its rejection of "any 'linkage' and 'parallelism' between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as being manifestly incompatible with the letter and spirit of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)"[4] and reprehensible and gross interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

49. The present stance of the other members of the contact group is no less regrettable. We are concerned that, by allowing the unwarranted preoccupations of one member of the group to cloud their collective judgement on Namibia, they have in large measure, even given statements dissociating certain members from the insistence on linkage, facilitated the sabotaging of a plan of which they were the authors and which they promoted for international acceptance and, in consequence, turned their backs on the freedom of the Namibian people.

50. If the *apartheid* régime has found renewed vigour in the execution of its policies of intimidation and repression inside Namibia, of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring African States or of brazen disregard of international opinion, both in its actions and in its pronouncements, it is obviously because of the moral support and political protection that constructive engagement affords it. The régime

is, through a combination of various forms of pressure, in particular armed aggression, now poised to try to reverse the victories achieved over the past decade.

51. Inside Namibia itself, the situation has greatly deteriorated as the régime has stepped up repression in its bid to neutralize the opposition. Through a combination of tactics the régime has, on the one hand, been busy trying to set up a coalition of puppets under the so-called Multi-Party Conference umbrella and, on the other, intimidated, arrested and even killed those who have expressed opposition to colonialism and *apartheid*. In particular, members of SWAPO have been targeted for indiscriminate arrest, torture and other forms of violence and even death. Through this two-pronged strategy of the force of arms and political manipulation, the *apartheid* régime hopes to transform Namibia into another bantustan. The so-called Multi-Party Conference is nothing but another scheme hatched by the régime to undermine SWAPO by presenting an alternative in order to pave the way for the establishment of a bantustan. Yet, despite these manoeuvres and repressive measures, the people of Namibia have not succumbed to disillusion or despair. Instead they have remained undaunted in their resolve to oppose the occupation of their country. This resolute determination in the face of such violence has found expression in ever-increasing support for SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

52. Since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, there have been further attempts to bring the racist régime to the negotiating table. The Namibian independence talks, held in 1984 at Lusaka and Mindelo, were among such attempts aimed at securing South African agreement to begin the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Despite the serious reservations it had regarding the seriousness of the *apartheid* régime, SWAPO attended the talks and expressed its willingness to pursue constructive negotiations on the modalities of a cease-fire. Perhaps not unexpectedly, the *apartheid* régime used those opportunities to demonstrate yet again its contempt and arrogance. It invented new demands which had the express purpose of sabotaging those talks.

53. In this as well, the *apartheid* régime was not alone. The proponents of constructive engagement also took full advantage of those talks to try to impose on Angola and SWAPO unacceptable conditions for the withdrawal of the racist troops and for the independence of Namibia, not surprisingly in a framework different from the plan embodied in resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, the letter from the *apartheid* representative to the Secretary-General dated 23 November 1984 [*A/39/689*] illustrates the nature of those conditions, without whose fulfilment, the proponents seem to be saying, the independence of Namibia will not be facilitated.

54. This most recent twist in the position of the racist régime has brought to the surface the real problem of South Africa and its allies. It is not the Cuban troops; rather it is the independence of Angola and that of the other neighbouring African States and their principled opposition to racism and colonial occupation in South Africa and Namibia. It is not because of any security concern. It has been suggested, legitimately, that constructive engagement, as it relates both to the political, military and economic partnership with *apartheid* and to linkage, does in fact suggest some racial overtones; for how can it be morally acceptable and politically tenable to embark on a relationship with a racist white minority on the basis of arrangements which seek only to perpetuate racism and aggression? The black people of South Africa are denied the most fundamental human rights, excluded from political activity, uprooted from their homes, banished, tortured, killed, stripped of the nationality of the land of their ancestors; yet they are told to endure that humiliation and oppression, as the perpetrators of these heinous crimes are given tools for the further entrenchment of *apartheid*. The people of Namibia are told they cannot get independence unless the *apartheid* régime is rewarded for its aggression against Angola. It is Angola, whose territory is occupied, which should express security concerns. It is Lesotho, Botswana, Mozambique and Zimbabwe themselves, constant victims of the *apartheid* régime's policies of economic pressure, sabotage, destabilization and armed aggression, which have legitimate security concerns. It is therefore unacceptable that attempts should be made to present distortions of the political situation in the region to justify South Africa's aggression.

55. The problems of southern Africa should be seen in their true context. *Apartheid* in South Africa and the occupation of Namibia, made necessary by the desire of the racist régime to create a buffer State to cushion itself, constitute the root cause of the conflict. If, after numerous efforts, the people of Namibia still have not been able to determine their political future, it is because this goal has been constantly separated from the real nature of the struggle against colonial domination and racism in that country.

56. No excuses, falsifications or even outright lies can obscure that fundamental element; attempts to interpret the struggle for the dismantling of *apartheid* and for securing independence for Namibia in the context of ideological confrontation between the East and the West have to be strongly rejected.

57. The manoeuvres of the *apartheid* régime in the course of the past year have reinforced the universal recognition that the Namibian problem is a United Nations problem and that, hence, it should be dealt with under the auspices of the Organization. Security Council resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) both underline this imperative. In this respect, I wish to register Tanzania's satisfaction with the manner in which the Secretary-General has dealt with the question, in particular by reasserting the central role of the Organization in the negotiations for the independence of Namibia.

58. Consistent with this position, we continue to believe that the United Nations plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the most viable framework within which the Organization can play that central role. The resolution embodies the international consensus. Despite the passage of time, it retains its intrinsic validity and continues to be the most acceptable basis for a negotiated settlement. We continue to demand its immediate implementation, without qualification or modification. Correspondingly, this Assembly must continue to reject linkage, demand the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and call for respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, in accordance with Security Council resolution 432 (1978). Similarly, the Assembly must energetically condemn the *apartheid* régime's policies of destabilization and

aggression against neighbouring independent African States, in particular its continued occupation of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola.

59. The continued illegal presence of South Africa and *apartheid* in Namibia poses a unique challenge to the international community, and in particular to the United Nations, which, 18 years ago, decided to assume direct responsibility for the Territory. The persistence of this aggression against the Namibian people has serious implications for international peace and security. Clearly, in its persistent occupation, the régime has also prevented the realization by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Moreover, the *apartheid* régime has continuously used the Territory as a staging-ground for its acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States. The *apartheid* régime has not shown any regard for the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. As a result, conflict is bound to escalate. Failure to act now will only pave the way for a total conflagration in the region.

60. The Security Council has to act and institute effective measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, against the racist régime, so as to force it to end its occupation of Namibia and to dismantle *apartheid*. This represents the last non-violent option for securing the régime's compliance.

61. Allow me next to pay a deserved tribute to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. Its commitment to the liberation of Namibia and the high sense of statesmanship demonstrated by its leadership in the face of the ever-multiplying insidious manoeuvres to delay independence underline its continued readiness to seek a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. At the same time, we continue to support their struggle, on all fronts and by every means available, including armed struggle, to wrest their freedom from the *apartheid* régime.

62. My delegation has had the pleasure of working closely with the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, during this session. His release from the notorious Robben Island and his presence in our midst resulted from support for the international campaign for the release of political prisoners. Many still languish in *apartheid* prisons. We should continue to demand their unconditional release.

63. I wish finally to record Tanzania's appreciation for the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and for the excellent manner in which its President has guided its work over the past year.

64. Mr. MAHBUBANI (Singapore): The history of Namibia is characterized by decades of painful colonization and denial of self-determination. In the first part of my statement I shall briefly review the history of the problem.

65. From 1884 to 1915, South West Africa, as Namibia was known then, was under German administration. After the outbreak of the First World War, South African forces invaded and occupied the Territory. From 1920 to 1938, the League of Nations Mandate over South West Africa was held by "His Britannic Majesty, [and] exercised on his behalf by the Union of South Africa".

66. The United Nations, in 1946, recommended trusteeship status for South West Africa. However, in 1949 South Africa informed the United Nations that it would no longer transmit information on the Territory as recommended by the international system for Territories. The International Court of Justice, in 1950, ruled that "South West Africa is still a Territory under international Mandate assumed by the Union of South Africa . . . [and] that South Africa continues to have international obligations".[5] In 1964, South Africa decided to implement the policy of establishing separate non-white "homelands" and exclusively white areas. South Africa's Mandate, therefore, was terminated by the United Nations in 1966 [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] and an *Ad Hoc* Committee for South West Africa, composed of 14 Member States, was established to recommend practical means for administering the Territory. In 1967, a United Nations Council for South West Africa, composed of 11 Member States, was set up [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*] to administer the Territory until independence. In 1968, the General Assembly proclaimed that South West Africa would thenceforth be known as "Namibia", and decided that the United Nations Council for South West Africa should be called the "United Nations Council for Namibia" and that the United Nations Commissioner for South West Africa should be called the "United Nations Commissioner for Namibia" [*see resolution 2372 (XXII)*].

67. In 1971, the International Court of Justice ruled that States Members were obliged to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and to refrain from assisting that régime. This opinion was supported both by the Security Council and by the General Assembly. In fact, as history clearly shows, from 1969 to the present, numerous resolutions and declarations calling on South Africa to withdraw from Namibia have been adopted by the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership.

68. Over a span of almost four decades, the United Nations has steadfastly supported the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in a free and united Namibia. These efforts culminated in the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which established the modalities by which the people of Namibia would be able to determine their future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

69. In this regard, it is indeed regrettable that, notwithstanding the progress made in the negotiations thus far, obstacles have continued to be placed in the path of the people of Namibia in their efforts to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence. My delegation regrets that the United Nations plan, which South Africa accepted six years ago, has not been implemented. The deplorable behaviour of South Africa only prolongs the agony and travail of the Namibian people, causing more bloodshed and endangering peace and development in the region. We, in Singapore, regard South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia as illegal and as lacking in legal, political or moral justification.

70. Moreover, it must be noted that there are other States that defy United Nations resolutions calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from occupied territories. By their examples, those States are contributing to South Africa's defiance by suggesting that United Nations resolutions have no impact on them. Just as those States ignore United Nations resolu-

tions on such issues, so South Africa continues to be intransigent and flouts United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

71. The Government of Singapore therefore reiterates its conviction that the people of Namibia should be given the right to self-determination, freedom and independence. This is a right enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and the Government of South Africa cannot take it away from the Namibian people.

72. We also regard the imposition by South Africa in Namibia of its policy of *apartheid* as morally repugnant and contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. We call for an immediate end to the racist practices of the South African authorities in Namibia.

73. Finally, my delegation supports the struggle of the Namibian people to liberate themselves from South African colonialism and racism. We welcome the leading role played by SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people in their struggle to end the illegal occupation of their territory by South Africa. We also call upon the international community to continue its support for the people of Namibia in their efforts to attain their independence.

74. We deeply regret the continued lack of cooperation by South Africa in the implementation of the Bangkok Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [*A/39/24, part two, chap. III, sect. B*], adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 25 May 1984. We cannot but condemn the various obstacles and excuses which the Government of South Africa has put forward over the past six years in order to avoid implementation of the United Nations plan. My delegation hopes that South Africa will not create additional obstacles to impede the peace process that would finally give Namibia its independence.

75. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Many words have been spoken both before and during the current General Assembly debate on the question of Namibia, but I should like to add a few more from the delegation of Ghana as our expression of disapproval of the illegality that continues to attend that Territory and as an expression of our solidarity with the people of Namibia. It is the conviction of my delegation that the international consensus on this vexed question should be loud and clear so that posterity can judge those who supported the intentional hindrance of Namibia's independence.

76. My delegation's intervention in the current debate is also testimony to the keen desire of the Government and people of Ghana to see the people of Namibia immediately exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence and thereby end the suffering under the notoriously oppressive colonial administration of the racist South African régime.

77. It is nearly 40 years now since the United Nations was first seized of the question of Namibia, yet all efforts by this body to seek a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia's independence have persistently been frustrated by the *apartheid* régime. The General Assembly and several of its subsidiary bodies have adopted hundreds of resolutions and decisions on this question, but to no avail. The International Court of Justice, to which recourse has been had on the many aspects of the Namibian question, has given its unequivocal opinion, but this has not changed the situation. Even the revered Security Council remains defied by South Africa through certain procedural contradictions of that body itself.

78. It is worth recalling today that South Africa's Mandate over Namibia ceased in 1966 after the General Assembly, having failed to persuade South Africa to subject its administration of Namibia to United Nations supervision, rightly assumed legal authority over the Territory. That decision was endorsed by the Security Council in 1969 and later in 1970, when the Council declared South Africa's continued hold on Namibia illegal and, consequently, called upon all States to ensure that neither they nor their companies engaged in economic activities in the Territory without prior recourse to the United Nations. This latter decision received the backing of the International Court of Justice, which, a year later, enjoined all Member States to consider it obligatory to acknowledge the illegality of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia.

79. All these measures having failed to secure the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole legal Administering Authority of the Territory, was compelled to issue its Decree No. 1,[1] the provisions of which are well known to all delegations.

80. The irrefutability, under international law, of Namibia's right to independence cannot be questioned in this Assembly or anywhere else. Not even the friends of South Africa can question the legal foundation of that right. The *status quo*, which was imposed on Namibia by South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, is therefore unacceptable, since it represents an insidious and consistent attempt by South Africa to hang on to political control of the Territory and thus maintain an atmosphere which allows the unrestrained and depletive exploitation of Namibia's natural resources by itself and its allies. It also means the denial to the citizens of Namibia of the exercise of their God-given right to self-determination and justice. Above all, the *status quo* in Namibia constitutes a flagrant violation by South Africa of the universally accepted principles prescribed by such international forums as the General Assembly. In the face of all this, it is stunning that the international community continues to be powerless to get the question of Namibia resolved once and for all. South Africa is thus an undisputed perpetrator of colonialism, exploitation and discrimination which Member States seem collectively to be too scared to bring to book.

81. Only the cynical and the economically greedy would accept the present situation as satisfactory, even in part. The overwhelming majority of the international community knows that the current impasse over Namibia's independence is something that has been contrived to give political, economic and racial advantage to the racist régime and its friends, and that the sincere political will of all of us is necessary to end the suffering of the Namibian people from the most heinous colonial system mankind has ever known.

82. Indeed, we know as a fact that the lack of progress towards independence for Namibia derives from the encouragement that the colonial Power continues to receive from certain powerful Member States of the United Nations. Whether they realize it

or not—and we suspect they do—their quaint political theories and practices have the unfortunate effect of propping up the *apartheid* régime in the Territory and in South Africa. The whole world can now see that these friends of South Africa will continue to support the régime for as long as the persistence of that régime advances their own global, economic and hegemonistic ambitions.

83. These powerful Member States I have referred to are the same countries which extol the virtues of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and even give the impression of sparing no effort to ensure its application to their own societies. Yet their Governments refuse to see the universality of this Declaration when it involves the criminal and dehumanizing practices of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa and Namibia.

84. The duplicity of South Africa's allies is now clear to all, and we again implore them to join the voices of international decency in calling a halt to the suffering of Namibians. It is now only too obvious that these allies of *apartheid* share South Africa's guilt in unceasingly creating one technical obstacle after another to postpone Namibia's independence indefinitely. Refusal to listen to the voice of moderation will continue to attract violence and ultimate retribution, as was the case, for example, with the practitioners of nazism.

85. The question of Namibia remains a decolonization issue which ought to be tackled purely within the context of the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*], as well as other relevant United Nations resolutions. The injection of extraneous conditions into the process of Namibia's decolonization, therefore, constitutes an unjustifiable affront to the international will expressed in these United Nations decisions. It is in this regard that the delegation of Ghana wishes to reaffirm the continuing relevance of Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which implicitly determined that the creation by the United States Government and the *apartheid* régime of South Africa of the parallelism concept, which links Namibia's independence to extraneous factors, particularly the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, was incompatible with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which defines the acceptable process for the granting of independence to Namibia.

86. Because of our own commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to decolonization especially, my Government cannot accept the delaying tactics that this linkage theory seeks to introduce into the entire negotiating process. While it unfortunately drags the independence of Namibia into the intractable quagmire of the cold war, one can also see in it an attempt to buy time for the South African Government to promote its own sham independence process, which is bound to leave the *status quo* unchanged. It is an old and dirty political game, practised with dubious success elsewhere, and we will contribute our strength in fighting it.

87. The United Nations Council for Namibia draws our attention to the seriousness of the problem in its report when it states:

> "At the same time, South Africa sought further to entrench its illegal occupation of Namibia through the massive militarization of the Territory and brutalization of the Namibian people, as well as detention and assassination of supporters and members of SWAPO." [*See A/39/24, part two, chap. II, sect. A, para. 160.*]

This is a charge that the friends of South Africa cannot deny. And, if that is so, why do they aid and abet illegality?

88. The mechanism prescribed by the United Nations, as endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), remains, in the considered opinion of my delegation, the only legitimate basis for securing true justice and independence for the Namibian people. After all, Namibia is the legal responsibility of the United Nations and this world body is itself bound by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) to work for the true exercise of the right to self-determination by the Namibian people.

89. Having said this, I must add that my delegation can no longer expect any good to come from the efforts of the Western contact group with regard to Namibia's independence. Perhaps it is superfluous to say this since the group is now moribund, but for purposes of clarification it ought to be recorded in this debate. Following the group's own history, characterized by the persistent granting of concessions to the *apartheid* régime, we have seen the group's credibility seriously undermined by the policies of its members, particularly the United States, whose so-called constructive engagement policy towards South Africa has been found to be responsible for the intensification of the régime's repression of the people of South Africa and Namibia and the escalation of tension in the southern African region.

90. In our own view, the group's clout has been severely diminished by the activities of one particular member and it needs to decide whether to proceed differently or relinquish the initiative. How can the international community continue to rely on a group some of whose members have been found to be pursuing policies that are negating the very cause they are supposed to be working for?

91. The struggle of the Namibian people for national liberation is legendary and will certainly be noted in history as one of the most heroic struggles of this century. With only a small population and very few resources they continue to wage an armed struggle which has won the sympathy and respect of the international community. They have been denied assistance and called terrorists by certain Western countries, although the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/146 of 20 December 1976, recognized the legitimacy of the armed struggle of the Namibians. Namibian combatants have successfully confronted 100,000 South African troops. South Africa has been forced to spend over 3 million rand a day to hang on to the Territory. In terms of human and material resources, this wastage can be ill-afforded by either side. We call on Member States, therefore, to join in the effort to bring Namibia to independence in the year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

92. The United Nations is our only hope, and we urge that concrete steps now be taken to ensure the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We hope that the Security Council will, as a matter of urgency, apply all the rules and forces at its disposal to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, as well as its repressive policies at home. The imposition by the Council of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime as

provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations is overdue.

93. We also wish to reiterate an appeal to Member countries and their multinational corporations to cease forthwith all collaboration with the *apartheid* régime and to ensure full compliance with Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.[1] These countries and their multinational corporations should be reminded that legitimate economic activity in independent Namibia stands everybody in better stead than the current looting that is going on in the Territory. The people of Namibia have a legitimate right to benefit from the exploitation of their natural resources and this must not be denied them through the feet-dragging and prevarication of some of our membership.

94. Finally, Ghana will continue to uphold its commitment to the struggle of the Namibian people to attain freedom and justice, as we sincerely believe that our own independence remains incomplete while a part of Africa remains under colonial oppression.

95. May I conclude by paying tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the able manner in which it has been able to keep alive the question of Namibia on the international front. The Council can count on Ghana's continuous support in all its efforts in the time ahead until final victory is achieved for Namibians and for human decency.

96. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of Namibia poses a growing challenge to the community of States. For decades, the United Nations has been obliged to tolerate one of the most flagrant violations of international law within our memory, yet it has not been able to enforce its decisions, many of which were adopted unanimously.

97. There has been practically no progress since 1966, when the General Assembly decided to end the Mandate over Namibia. We have made progress, of course, in defining principles and in consolidating international support for Namibia's independence, but it is also true that the plundering of Namibian resources and the exploitation of its inhabitants is on the increase, that the support which South Africa receives from its allies is becoming more open and that we have failed to put an end to the *apartheid* régime or to the constant acts of aggression by Pretoria against the countries of the region.

98. The difficult economic situation currently affecting the African continent, combined with the strengthening of the links on the part of various Powers with the South African régime and the re-emergence of hegemonistic theories and practices, have provided today a political framework that is propitious for encouraging covert recolonization.

99. The independence of Namibia is not only a symbol which tests the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; it is also a test case, the outcome of which will tell the developing countries what they can actually expect of us in the near future.

100. If the community of nations truly wishes to solve the problem of Namibia, it should use the methods provided for under the Charter and make them sufficiently deterrent that the Pretoria régime and its supporters will abide by our decisions.

101. We cannot go on accepting indefinitely the impotence of the United Nations. Our frustration must be translated into collective action to end the impunity of South Africa, otherwise we will be consenting to the submission of the will of the international community to intimidation and to the strategic interests of great Powers.

102. Mexico reaffirms its conviction that the solution to this problem lies in the application of resolutions adopted by the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The various diplomatic efforts that have been made should be understood exclusively as a search for ways and means of enforcing those decisions. In no way should they be seen as a stratagem for distorting them, forgetting them or violating them.

103. It would appear that some of the parties involved in the process of negotiation are not yet committed to resolution 435 (1978). The application of that resolution has been postponed because of the emergence of new requirements that have nothing to do with the question of Namibia and which, furthermore, constitute an encroachment on the sovereignty of independent States. As the independence of Namibia is postponed, so we see an increase in acts of destabilization designed to strengthen, over the long term, the domination of the South African régime and assure the survival of *apartheid*.

104. We should make sure that the terms of the problem are not distorted. The Summit Meeting of the Front-line States, held at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, on 29 April 1984, confirmed the wholehearted support of the Heads of State and Government and the leaders of the liberation movements for the struggle of the people of Namibia against colonialism, and that of the people of South Africa against *apartheid*.

105. The Final Communiqué of that Meeting,[6] welcomed by the Council for Namibia at its most recent special meeting, makes it clear that in both countries the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, led by SWAPO and the African National Congress of South Africa [*ANC*] respectively, are waging a political struggle for their liberation and sovereignty. Those struggles, supported by the United Nations, are between the people of Namibia and the occupying Power, and between the people of South Africa and the Pretoria régime, respectively.

106. Genuine stability and just and harmonious progress in the region must be based on the full exercise of national and human rights by the peoples of southern Africa. Any other approach is unacceptable in the light of the resolutions of the United Nations and serves only the goals of strategic, political and economic domination.

107. Most Member States take part in good faith and with a deep commitment to peace in the effort to resolve this long-standing controversy. If the principal allies of South Africa were to do the same, Namibia would already have won its self-determination, and southern Africa would today be a zone of independent development.

108. It is worth noting that the Security Council has practically ceased to try to enforce its resolution 418 (1977), imposing an arms embargo against South Africa. The report of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa,[7] which was submitted on 19 December 1980 to a meeting of the Security Council, has not even been discussed, so that the work of that body has been wasted. All this serves to

consolidate the impunity of the Pretoria régime and to enable the States which support it to do so freely.

109. The gravity of the violations committed in the region demands a more effective response by the international community. On a number of occasions we have spoken in favour of the total isolation of the Pretoria régime and the imposition of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The repeated refusal to take such measures, on the pretext of the alleged efficacy of persuasion, has served only to cover up complicity and to strengthen the position of the transgressor State.

110. It is time for an energetic reaction by the United Nations now that we are approaching the celebration of its fortieth anniversary. We cannot allow that date to pass without bringing about the independence of Namibia. The responsibility of all States in the matter is undeniable, and the conduct of each State in this regard will give clear evidence of its respect for the provisions of the Charter and binding international commitments.

111. The delegation of Mexico once again expresses its support for the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which we are a loyal and active member. We believe that they should be adopted in their entirety, so as to reaffirm our full support for the Council, our respect for its decisions and our recognition of the facts that it denounces, and to promote relevant international action.

112. Mexico's position has been consistent with United Nations decisions, which we enthusiastically helped to draw up and whose implementation we fully support. Our attitude is based on respect for the fundamental principles of international coexistence: the peoples' right to independence and self-determination, the peaceful coexistence of States and the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations—principles that my country has always and in all circumstances defended.

113. Those values, which have been denied in southern Africa, are increasingly being flouted in other parts of the world. We must reaffirm them today with the greatest vigour, because they could be severely damaged if their interpretation or application were subordinated to agreements between Powers.

114. In the debate on the question of Namibia at the thirty-fifth session [*109th meeting, para. 194*], my delegation opposed the division of the world into spheres of influence. We said then that we could not tolerate a situation in which our countries would have the doubtful honour of becoming strategic frontiers; nor could we accept their being turned into battlefields by those seeking world domination.

115. Today, when we see signs of a possible improvement in relations between the super-Powers, we believe that that should be repeated. The relaxation of tension between the Power blocs can contribute to solving international problems, as long as it does not give rise to a new definition of zones of influence or security which would frustrate the desire of most States for independence and development.

116. That will be the principal challenge facing the United Nations in the years to come. Therefore, we must strengthen its authority and prestige in the immediate solution of problems that, like the Namibian problem, are a test of the principles that justify the existence of the United Nations and make it democratic.

117. Mr. MAYE ELA (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is 16 years since my country became independent. I should like to recall here the words spoken on 12 October 1968 by the man elected our first constitutional President, in his address marking that historic event. He said:

> "Today we are celebrating the accession of Equatorial Guinea to the status of a free, sovereign and independent State, but Equatorial Guinea cannot feel itself completely free while there continue to exist on the African continent Territories under the yoke of colonial domination and until the inhuman *apartheid* régime in South Africa has been abolished."

118. I have made that reference in order to repeat the appeals made by the international community to South Africa, through resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, to grant independence to the African people of Namibia and to abolish the hateful *apartheid* régime that prevails in South Africa—the only place still experiencing the horrors and sufferings inflicted by colonial systems.

119. In his statement to the General Assembly on 11 October this year, during the general debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Equatorial Guinea said:

> "We reiterate our position that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and must be ended. We renew our support for the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*] and reaffirm that conditions and circumstances outside the Territory of Namibia should not affect or delay the process of its independence." [*31st meeting, para. 22.*]

120. It is surprising to note that all Member States agree about the need to maintain international peace and security, but that this unanimity does not seem to extend to the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In South Africa, the black majority continues to suffer from the effects of the policy of *apartheid*, an inhuman system imposed upon them, which we all abhor and condemn. However, some are selective in their condemnation, and their opposition takes different forms in different circumstances—apparently because of economic, strategic and ideological interests. Because people believe that those interests are at stake, they take us further away from the great objective of defending fundamental human rights and freedoms. We believe that there must be deep soul-searching and that, even though it may be difficult, we must all admit that nature itself dictates recognition of the fact that all peoples are entitled to enjoy the same rights, and that therefore *apartheid* must be abolished.

121. We congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, who has guided and directed its work with wisdom and skill. The valuable and ceaseless efforts in the search for a peaceful solution ending in the total and unconditional liberation of Namibia deserve our commendation.

122. We would also like to commend the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to maintain contacts with all Member States that have expressed their convergent opinions and views [*A/39/508*]. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and

Peoples, has exhaustively and fully set forth its decisions and general views in its reports and working documents now before us, and we commend them.

123. A short while ago, we commemorated the one-hundredth anniversary of the heroic struggle of the valiant people of Namibia against the diabolical, inhuman régime of *apartheid*. We have seen how men like Mr. Toivo ya Toivo—who honoured this Assembly with an important statement [*78th meeting*]—having been imprisoned as young men full of energy, are today emerging from the Robben Island prison as grandfathers, but nevertheless have preserved their lucidity, vitality and militancy in the struggle for ultimate victory.

124. Equatorial Guinea will continue to support all processes leading to the unconditional freedom and independence of Namibia. At the same time, we vigorously condemn the repeated acts of aggression committed by the South African armed forces against neighbouring sovereign States, as well as the use of Namibian territory for launching those attacks, which have caused the loss of innocent human life and considerable material damage.

125. We should like to express our gratitude to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

126. In 1985, we will celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. My delegation believes that the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration will lose all significance and sense if the deplorable colonial situation of Namibia persists. We exhort Member States and the international community to exert the maximum pressure on South Africa and the States which co-operate with that country to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the other resolutions of the United Nations.

127. Mr. HERNÁNDEZ RESTREPO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Eighteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly terminated the South African Mandate in Namibia and proclaimed the inalienable right of its people to self-determination, freedom and independence.

128. Yet the people of Namibia are still under the illegal occupation of South Africa. Even as 100 years of struggle against foreign occupation is being commemorated, a last bastion of colonialism still exists in Africa.

129. The international community has almost unanimously reiterated in all the forums of the international system and those of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that the Namibian people should be enabled freely to exercise their inalienable rights.

130. There is no excuse for the prolongation of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. My delegation deplores the obstructive actions and policies that have prevented the full exercise of sovereignty by Namibia in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the resolutions, mandates and declarations of the United Nations.

131. Similarly, my delegation deplores the fact that despite the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971,[8] in response to a request of the Security Council in resolution 284 (1970), the people of Namibia have not as yet achieved independence.

132. My delegation calls urgently for the withdrawal of the forces occupying the Territory of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

133. My country rejects the arbitrary South African colonial occupation, which is in open violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and appeals, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which, as has been stated, are considered to constitute the most appropriate framework for the peaceful solution of the problem, without the subjection of resolution 435 (1978) and the plan for independence endorsed therein to any extraneous pre-conditions which are nothing but delaying tactics on the part of South Africa.

134. The Security Council, after having considered the further report of the Secretary-General[9] on the question of Namibia, following his trip through southern Africa, adopted without opposition, on 28 October 1983, resolution 539 (1983), which calls upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General forthwith in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

135. Our delegation considers that, if the activities of South Africa are preventing the achievement of the just objectives put forward in that resolution, the Security Council should adopt all necessary measures as provided for in the Charter to ensure that the process of independence of Namibia will not continue to be frustrated and that independence will indeed soon become a reality.

136. The United Nations Council for Namibia—whose admirable work deserves our praise because of the enthusiasm for the Namibian cause that it, together with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has aroused among the world public—has clearly described the magnitude of the natural resources of Namibia and indicated that the exploitation of those resources by foreigners is a factor that works against the cause of freedom and independence for that Territory.

137. The people of Namibia and the people of Namibia alone should administer and supervise the exploitation of those resources, especially the non-renewable resources. That is why the delegation of Colombia calls upon the United Nations Council for Namibia to implement Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[1] It is difficult for us to accept a situation in which, while foreign enterprises are illegally benefiting from the wealth of Namibia, its people suffer from discrimination and poverty.

138. My delegation is convinced that the elimination of that intervention and of the abhorrent practices of *apartheid*, which have been condemned and rejected by the international community, are essential in order to ensure that the peace, justice and prosperity desired by the whole region prevail in the countries of southern Africa.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

139. The United Nations has an unavoidable responsibility to ensure the speedy solution of the question of Namibia, and the international community has an undeniable commitment to consolidating

the Territory's independence. Namibia's cause is the common cause of mankind and a priority objective of the international policy of my country.

140. The delegation of Colombia would like to reiterate its thanks to the Secretary-General for his objective and diligent efforts to achieve a definitive solution to this question, and considers that his work should enjoy the full support of the international community.

141. Similarly, we should like to express our thanks to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the work it has accomplished under the guidance of Mr. Paul Lusaka who, with such flair, has been presiding over the proceedings in the Assembly.

142. My country would like to emphasize the role that has been played by SWAPO, as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, to assure that Namibia will achieve independence. We would also like to celebrate the release of Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, its Secretary-General.

143. Colombia, together with all countries sincerely committed to peace, freedom and justice, supports the people of Namibia in their just cause and would like to reiterate its unswerving solidarity with them.

144. We urge the international community to intensify its efforts and reaffirm its commitment so that we may soon see a free, united and independent Namibia.

145. Mr. BORODULIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, like the delegations of the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations which have already spoken from this rostrum, considers that, in the struggle for the speedy liberation of peoples still in the shackles of colonialism and racist oppression, the question of the genuine independence of Namibia—which is unlawfully occupied by the racist régime of South Africa—is one of the most topical, calling for an immediate solution.

146. Almost two decades ago, in a decision of the General Assembly, the United Nations deprived South Africa of the Mandate to administer Namibia and itself assumed the direct responsibility for that Territory until the Namibian people could reach genuine self-determination and national independence.

147. The international community, and in particular the United Nations, has, since then, made numerous efforts aimed at ending the domination of the racist régime of South Africa over Namibia and at securing the lawful interests of the Namibian people and its right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a unified Namibia.

148. In numerous resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and other authoritative international forums, it has been definitely indicated that the presence of the administration and armed forces of South Africa in the Territory of Namibia is against the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and must be halted unconditionally. The continuing unlawful occupation of Namibia by South Africa is an act of aggression against the Namibian people and a challenge flung at the United Nations. The South African racist régime's cruel repression of the people of Namibia, its armed aggression against independent African countries and its policy of *apartheid* constitute a threat to international peace and security, not only within the region but also beyond its confines.

149. Genuine ways and means of settling the problem of Namibia are clearly and definitely defined in United Nations decisions on this question as a whole, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In those decisions and, in the first instance, in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), we find the political basis for a just solution of the problem and the ensuring of a transition of Namibia to an independent and autonomous State.

150. Unfortunately, those decisions remain unimplemented because of the fact that the racist régime of South Africa is cynically continuing to ignore the clearly expressed will of the international community.

151. The South African colonialists are not simply being stubborn in their attempt to maintain their unlawful presence in Namibia, but they are also making feverish efforts to perpetuate the enslavement of its people. For these purposes, the racist clique is intensifying mass terror and oppression of the indigenous African population and is speedily building up the military potential of the occupation régime in Namibia by means of the enlistment of foreign elements and compulsory conscription of Namibians into military formations. It is also carrying on manipulations with the so-called system of self-determination in the occupied Territory.

152. Particularly dangerous is the South African régime's use of the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for unceasing acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African countries, in particular the People's Republic of Angola. Considerable areas of that sovereign State are to this day being occupied by the aggressor. The heinous policy against the indigenous population of the Republic of South Africa and the oppressed people of Namibia and the growing aggressiveness of the racist régime of Pretoria against the African front-line States are the principal sources of the dangerous tension in southern Africa and constitute a serious threat to international peace and security.

153. There is no doubt that the South African *apartheid* régime would not have been able to behave in such a defiant way if it had not received, as will be seen from various United Nations documents and other material, economic, military and other support from a number of Western countries—primarily the United States and Israel.

154. In the meeting and intertwining of the economic, political and strategic interests of the Western Powers and the racist Pretoria régime lurks one of the principal causes of the continuing tragedy of the Namibian people.

155. It is known that economic, financial and other circles in those countries are participating with the South African colonialists in the piratical exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia. Of 88 transnational corporations operating on Namibian territory, 35 are based in South Africa, 25 in the United Kingdom, 15 in the United States, 8 in the Federal Republic of Germany, 3 in France and 2 in Canada. According to the most modest estimates, 45 per cent of Namibia's gross national product is taken up by the net incomes of foreign monopolies. Approximately 36 per cent of the gross national product is taken outside the country in the form of profits, dividends and taxes. The indigenous people,

constituting more than 90 per cent of the population of the Territory, receive less than 10 per cent of the gross national product.

156. With the active co-operation of the Western Powers I have mentioned, and of Israel, the *apartheid* régime has succeeded in establishing the most powerful military machine on the African continent, by means of which it is trying to perpetuate its unlawful occupation of Namibia and to use the Territory as a bridgehead for subversive action and aggression against neighbouring independent African countries. The build-up of armed forces in the Territory is continuing, reaching such a level that today there is one racist soldier to every 12 inhabitants of Namibia.

157. The international community is particularly concerned about the unceasing co-operation of the United States, certain other Western countries and Israel with the racist Pretoria régime in the development of South Africa's nuclear potential. It is not difficult to visualize the possible dangerous consequences of this co-operation, which in fact gives the *apartheid* régime direct access to nuclear weapons.

158. In spite of the numerous appeals of the United Nations to all Member States to co-operate in ending the unlawful occupation of Namibia by South Africa and to adopt legislative, administrative and other necessary measures effectively to isolate the *apartheid* régime, certain well-known Western countries continue their policy of open support for it. The United States and other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] are doing everything in their power to hinder the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, in applying effective international sanctions, provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, against South Africa.

159. Moreover, the United States, which only recently had donned the mantle of self-styled mediator, has now dropped that disguise. The United States Administration has openly proclaimed racist South Africa to be its "historic ally", and it is developing relations with the *apartheid* régime on the basis of the notorious policy of "constructive engagement".

160. In justifying this sinister alliance, its members are trying by all means possible to distort the character of the Namibian problem and to link a just solution to totally irrelevant questions. At the same time, the United States and the *apartheid* régime of South Africa are increasing their overt pressure on African countries to complicate the situation in southern Africa, with the object of taking the question of Namibia out of the framework of the United Nations and solving it on a neo-colonialist basis in accordance with the narrow, selfish interests of the Western Powers.

161. The Byelorussian SSR firmly condemns the continuing unlawful occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and the unceasing manoeuvres of the United States and other Western Powers and racists to maintain the *apartheid* system in South Africa and implant a puppet régime in Namibia with the aim of undermining the foundations of a political settlement to the problem of southern Africa, a settlement that has been built into decisions of the United Nations—above all, those of the Security Council.

162. The Byelorussian SSR speaks out in favour of a speedy, unconditional implementation by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, on the basis of the maintenance of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, the immediate, total withdrawal from its Territory of all South African troops and administration, and the handing over of all authority to the people of Namibia, represented by SWAPO, recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] as the sole authentic representative of that nation.

163. We again declare our solidarity with, and total support for, the courageous struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia. The Byelorussian SSR has sided with, and will continue to side with, the peoples of the African front-line States in their efforts to defend their national independence and territorial integrity against the aggressive tendencies of the South African colonialists.

164. The United Nations—primarily the Security Council—bears a direct responsibility for ensuring that its decisions on Namibia are implemented so that a just solution to the Namibian problem may be found as soon as possible. In this connection, we support the demands of the African countries that the Security Council should introduce comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the South African régime, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

165. The time has long since passed for the Security Council fully to assume the main role in ensuring effective and permanent control over Namibia and guidance of the Territory towards total independence. This role includes the questions of the composition, leadership, location and activities of the United Nations mission to provide assistance to Namibia, as well as setting a date and a timetable for the mission.

166. In conclusion, I should like to refer to the important and very useful work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia in defending the interests of the Namibian people. We express our gratitude to the representative of Zambia, Mr. Lusaka, who directs the Council's work with such competence.

167. Our delegation will support the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Council [*A/39/24, part four, chap. I*] because the measures proposed there are aimed at the speedy attainment of freedom and independence by the people of Namibia.

168. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): As this is the first time during the present session of the General Assembly that I have had the honour of speaking, Sir, I cannot refrain from expressing my delegation's gratification at your presidency of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. Your presence in the Chair during consideration of this item in particular is especially fitting in view of the involvement in the issue of Namibian independence on the part of your President, your Government, your people and yourself. In fact, Zambia, as a front-line State, and Zambians have been part of all the initiatives and moves aimed at securing Namibian independence.

169. The continuing colonial status of Namibia is a source of anger and regret for all of us and should be a source of shame and embarrassment to those that

perpetuate this situation and those that support the racist colonial occupation authorities.

170. The history of the illegal South African occupation of Namibia is well known and I will not repeat it. Suffice it to say that if, to paraphrase Gibbon, history is the register of the crimes, follies and misfortunes of mankind, then the modern history of southern Africa is the register of the crimes and follies of the *apartheid* State and its imperialist allies, of its military adventurism and of the misfortunes of the oppressed people of the region.

171. Since 1978, the issue of genuine and complete independence for Namibia has been a priority issue for the People's Republic of Angola in particular and for the front-line States in general, but the issue has been bogged down by one obstacle after another manufactured by the racist South African régime and its imperialist allies. It has been the commitment of SWAPO and the Government of Angola to the fulfilment of the aspirations of the people that has led to the breaking of the deadlock on each occasion.

172. Surely the international community remembers the 1979 proposals put forward by the Angolan leadership which allowed the stalemate created by the Pretoria régime to be broken. Since then, despite the most terrible and trying times for the Angolan nation, of which the international community in general and the Security Council in particular have been made aware, Angola has been in the forefront of the support for SWAPO and the liberation struggle of the Namibians.

173. In fact, the unwavering championship of the Namibian cause has earned the Angolan people a terrible retribution from the racist régime in Pretoria: massive invasions of my country; armed aggression; the military occupation of parts of southern Angola since 1981; the systematic destruction of national property far beyond that caused by conflict, in fact, vandalism of a strategic kind aimed at harming and sabotaging national reconstruction; the destruction of transportation and communication lines; the kidnapping of technical assistance advisers working with our people; the brutal treatment of children; the murder of unarmed civilians, including women and children; the killing of livestock—in short, a sustained battering at the Angolan Government, institutions, infrastructure and people through invasions, occupation, artillery attacks, air raids, bombings and sabotage.

174. It is a matter of record that in the face of this adversity the Angolan Government and people, true to the principles of their revolution, have remained firm in their solidarity with the people of Namibia.

175. We have made a pledge to see the liberation and genuine independence of Namibia, through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), come about. To that end, even at considerable human, national, economic, political, territorial and diplomatic cost, the leadership of Angola—the MPLA Workers Party[10] and the Government—has displayed creativity and flexibility, without compromise, regarding the problems which impede or are said to impede the independence of Namibia and threaten peace in southern Africa and has sought solutions to the real as well as the manufactured problems.

176. The position of the Government and the people of Angola has always been clear, consistent, constant and unequivocal: solidarity with and support for SWAPO and the Namibian people in their effort to wrest from the jaws of the racist Power the independence and freedom which are theirs by history, by law and by right.

177. Recently, the Secretary-General and the international community were informed of the steps taken by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola with the essential objectives of guaranteeing the independence of Namibia through the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), achieving the withdrawal of South African forces from the south of Angola, securing international guarantees for Angola's security, independence and territorial integrity and contributing to the establishment of lasting peace in southern Africa.

178. Angola has bled and has been bleeding for over 500 years. First there were five centuries of oppressive colonial rule, then 14 years of a heroic and brutal war of liberation, then a racist war of aggression from the day of the announcement of our independence, then a military occupation of parts of southern Angola since 1981.

179. In December 1983, the racist invaders, to deflect mounting international condemnation, presented proposals on the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola, to which my Government gave an encouraging response. A year later, in December 1984, South African troops are today still in occupation in southern Angola, 25 miles inside Angolan territory, hundreds of miles from the South African border, and we are being asked to take seriously the words of the racist régime. South Africa continues to support the quisling UNITA[11] bands in its continuing attempts to destabilize the legitimate Government of Angola.

180. South Africa supplies these puppets and lackeys, trains them, arms them, finances them and gives them bases in northern Namibia to which they retreat when faced with the wrath of the Angolan people. The traitor Savimbi betrayed his people, his country, his history, and shamed an entire continent by being the only black man present at the Botha investiture ceremony. The rest of Africa remained silent at this blatant betrayal.

181. Despite all these problems facing us, the President of Angola, Comrade José Eduardo dos Santos, and the Angolan people have given proof of their goodwill and seriousness in seeking peace for the solution of the Namibian problem. The international community knows that the Angolan President and his people will never walk away from their responsibility to the region and to the African continent.

182. However, I will presume on the Assembly's patience to examine for a moment the ludicrous racist assertion that the Cuban internationalist forces in Angola pose a threat to the security of South Africa. Luanda is 2,300 kilometres from the Orange River and Cabinda is 2,740 kilometres from the Orange River. By this token, if we apply the racist assertion to a geographical trajectory, over three fourths of the African continent is in danger from the Cuban internationalist forces in Angola. The racist charge of "danger" is laughable, especially when not a single Angolan, let alone a Cuban soldier, has ever set foot outside the sovereign borders of Angola, while the racist armed forces of South Africa and its lackeys and mercenaries have been illegally present in over half a dozen sovereign African countries. And

Angola, I need not remind the General Assembly, does not share even a centimetre of a border with South Africa, a fact which the racist régime conveniently chooses to overlook.

183. Even a cursory analysis of the situation leads us to conclude that the Pretoria régime intends to perpetuate *apartheid* and exert by force and sabotage its political, economic and social domination in southern Africa, with an expansionist thrust towards the entire African continent.

184. No, a far greater threat to the racist régime, system and structure is not from some internationalist forces in Angola—and Pretoria well knows this—but first and foremost from within South Africa, from its 22 million oppressed and exploited blacks, who are supported by Africa's population of over 250 million. To paraphrase an ancient proverb: "Dictators ride on tigers which they dare not dismount, and the tigers are getting hungry".

185. The Assembly has heard enough on the problems of Namibia. Now we need to see action on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) for the attainment of independence by Namibia. I say with regret that in the past decades political problems have been dealt with bilaterally or regionally, outside the United Nations, thus negating one of the main reasons for the existence of the Organization. But the question of Namibia is unique because the United Nations, through the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia, is the sole legal Administering Authority for Namibia. Therefore, it is mandatory that the United Nations take action and retrieve the authority to speak on and for Namibia, authority which it has allowed to be usurped.

186. My delegation read with interest and some amusement the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa very shortly after I had handed over my President's letter to the Secretary-General. The irrelevant and extraneous factor of the presence of the Cuban internationalist forces in Angola was not manufactured by South Africa and its allies until 1981, while the operative resolution on the implementation of Namibian independence dates back to 1978.

187. The independence of Namibia has occupied the attention of the Angolan leadership and people almost as much as our own independence. As my President declared in his statement at the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, the platform contains the fundamental official position of the Angolan Government on the question of Namibia and southern Africa. He further stated that the Governments of the United States and South Africa now have the opportunity to demonstrate to the world their seriousness in the negotiations and their desire to contribute effectively to the solution of the problems of our region with respect to the issues of sovereignty and territorial integrity.

188. Angolans are still prepared to say: "Victory at all costs. Victory in spite of all terror. Victory however long and hard the road may be. For without victory there is no survival."

189. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

190. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): By this debate we mark the end of another frustrating year in the search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian conflict, the end of the sixth year in the fruitless and precarious life of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the second anniversary of the 1982 agreement, equally fruitless to date, by which all the remaining impediments to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) were deemed by all parties to the Namibian conflict to have been successfully negotiated and finally resolved.

191. For the people of Namibia, this debate and the year 1984 mark on the one hand the culmination of a century of wrong and on the other the commemoration of a century of heroic struggle against colonialism, led by SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The occasion is both one to be reviled and condemned and one to be remembered and honoured. It is an occasion which must permit us the opportunity to look back with a mixture of pride and sorrow, to seek counsel from the past 100 years of colonial oppression and anti-colonial resistance in Namibia, as we prepare for the future with a new affirmation of faith in the ultimate triumph of the forces of justice over those of injustice.

192. Yes, the Namibian struggle will triumph, even if for the present we are forced to admit that the revelations of the past week, particularly those in South Africa's letter of pre-conditions for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), constitute a very serious obstacle. Yes, even if it is painful to admit that for the moment the grand vision of a free, independent and proud Namibia, as laid out so carefully and meticulously in the United Nations plan for the peaceful liberation of Namibia, remains nothing more than a vision yet to be fulfilled—indeed, even though it may appear that we are seeing the dying days of resolution 435 (1978). Yes, but the dream and love of freedom will never die in the minds and hearts of Namibians whatever fate befalls Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This fact, this nagging reality, must be understood by those who would have us share the mistaken belief that the Namibian freedom struggle can be frustrated to death.

Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Vice-President, took the Chair.

193. We remain committed to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in the shape and form in which we have known it over the past six years. That is why we are adamantly opposed to the linkage by which South Africa seeks to tamper with the integrity of that resolution. One has only to consider seriously the contents of the letter contained in document A/39/689 to realize that the linkage has burgeoned into a full-fledged parallel plan for Namibia—parallel to resolution 435 (1978). Armed with the inflated arrogance of a self-appointed regional super-Power, South Africa, through its plan, seeks to ensure not only that Namibia proceeds to independence on Pretoria's terms but also that the affairs of the entire region of southern Africa are reordered in the image of a South Africa dedicated to the preservation of white domination and supremacy.

194. The South African plan is replete with latter-day interpretations of resolution 435 (1978) and with ingenious and nefarious assertions of new understandings cunningly twisted to explain away Pretoria's attempt to clothe the chicanery of its intentions in the garb of good faith. Consider, as just one instance, the assertion under the heading "Political

Principles" that "resolution 435 does not preclude the establishment of a cessation of hostilities prior to its implementation" [*see A/39/689*]. And this is an assertion made by a South Africa which utterly refused in Geneva in January 1981 at the pre-implementation meeting to sign a cease-fire when challenged to do so by the President of SWAPO. Why is a cease-fire so attractive now? We are extremely suspicious and wary, fully conscious, as we certainly are, that the South African cease-fire, the so-called cessation of hostilities, is one whose real purpose is known only to South Africa but which, we can safely conjecture, is meant to involve SWAPO in an unsophisticated conspiracy to sabotage the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It is a cessation of hostilities prior and in addition to the United Nations cease-fire. It is a ploy either to buy time for South Africa's occupation of Namibia or to lure SWAPO into the trap of capitulation.

195. The United Nations plan, as we have known it in the past six years, would become so deformed as to be totally unrecognizable and unimplementable if South Africa's parallel plan were to be incorporated into it. There is a clear indication in the South African letter to which I have already referred that the withdrawal of Cuban forces would serve as a mere appetizer for a deluge of insatiable demands, made not only on Angola but on the region of southern Africa as a whole. For we must ask: What would stop South Africa from demanding that all the countries of southern Africa take a census of their Cuban and East European guests and report to Pretoria for instructions? What would stop South Africa from making such a demand?

196. We are saying this to sharpen the sensitivity of the Assembly to the linkage issue and its consequences and ramifications for our region. The front-line State of Angola is no longer being asked simply to send Cuban internationalist forces home in return for an indefinite commitment on the part of South Africa to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); it is now being asked to undress in public: first, to restrict the number of Russian, East German and "other communist" advisers to 1978 levels; secondly, to furnish a list of East European advisers and their functions and whereabouts; and, thirdly, to furnish a list of all Cubans stationed in Angola. And all this is in addition to the arrogant demand that the Cuban forces not be replaced "by any other foreign forces" [*ibid.*]. That is the level to which the linkage issue has degenerated—as has, I am afraid, our hope and faith in the peaceful decolonization of Namibia.

197. Namibia cannot be peacefully decolonized in the face of the fact that the concept of simultaneity and/or parallelism, against which we have so often raved and ranted, has become so firmly entrenched that it is a position away from which it is not possible to move South Africa and the United States, even with a bulldozer. South Africa's letter states categorically and unashamedly:

> "It has been the consistent position of the South African and United States Governments that Cuban withdrawal from Angola should be carried out parallel with the reduction of South African forces in terms of United Nations Security Council resolution 435." [*Ibid.*]

But we all have to understand that the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia is the heart and soul of the United Nations plan for Namibia, for there can be no independence—peaceful independence—for Namibia so long as the Territory remains occupied by South African troops. Mortgage the removal of these troops to something else beyond the competence of SWAPO and the Namibian people and one has virtually ruled out Namibia's peaceful evolution to independence and encouraged the alternative of independence by bloody revolution.

198. That is the state of affairs in which we find ourselves at this most frightening period in the history of our region. The Security Council is in effect being challenged to accept South Africa's far-reaching and subversive amendments to resolution 435 (1978) and face the inevitable consequences, or to come to terms with the painful prospect of the United Nations plan becoming another failed attempt to liberate Namibia by peaceful means.

199. We have wasted six years trying, in the most futile way, to decide whether or not Namibia should proceed to independence through a process in which we all, ostensibly without exception, claim to repose our faith and confidence, a peaceful process whose central purpose is to stop Namibia's needless and wasteful bleeding and preserve its young generation for the daunting task of independence and nation-building.

200. We, the front-line States, and SWAPO have spared no effort to be reasonable; we have even tolerated a series of thinly disguised manoeuvres contrived to hijack the United Nations plan for Namibia. All this has been to no avail. And yet we stand ready to give peace, real and indivisible peace, a chance. As we have stated so often in the past, there can be no real, lasting peace in our region so long as millions of our fellow southern Africans, in Namibia and South Africa, remain in bondage. We challenge South Africa to co-operate with us in this collective endeavour. We challenge South Africa to demonstrate its peaceful intentions by co-operating in the implementation of a plan—Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—by which we seek to avoid further needless waste of the precious lives of young Namibians and South Africans in a war which, for South Africa in any case, is an exercise in sheer futility, because it cannot win that war.

201. South Africa has more than enough on its plate in South Africa itself, where a catastrophic revolution is threatening to erupt. There too we challenge South Africa to live up to its protestations of peaceful intentions by opening the floodgates of freedom before it is too late.

202. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): The year 1984 marks the centenary of the struggle of the people of Namibia to throw off the yoke of colonialism. Despite heroic efforts and countless sacrifices by these martyred people, despite the understanding and increasing assistance given to them by the international community, and despite the untiring and devoted efforts of the various bodies of the United Nations, which has been directly responsible for the fate of Namibia since 1966, the matter of the illegal occupation of the country by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is still before us. It is a totally unacceptable anachronism.

203. My delegation fully endorses the analysis of the present situation in Namibia, as well as the background and nature of the question of Namibia, as was set out in such a detailed and wise way on 29

November 1984 before the General Assembly. We would like to add the voice of our people to the universal indignation provoked by the stubborn manoeuvres of the racist régime of Pretoria aimed at perpetuating colonialism in Namibia through a policy of savage repression against the Namibian people and through a policy of aggression, subversion and constant pressure against neighbouring African countries, thus committing a dual crime, both against mankind and against peace.

204. Namibia is in fact the last significant bastion of old-style colonialism. Given the victorious progress of national liberation movements that have developed spontaneously and continually over the last four decades, the persistance of the colonial régime in Namibia today has become an insupportable paradox and a glaring injustice which weighs heavily on the conscience of our times. This is all the more so since the fate of this martyred country was directly linked to the League of Nations, and later to the United Nations, for more than 60 years. And, since the United Nations took the decision to assume direct responsibility for Namibia, more than 70 resolutions have been adopted in the vain search for a solution which would grant true independence to Namibia.

205. Why do we see this situation arise? The fundamental obstacle which continues to obstruct the road to independence for the Namibian people is the considerable body of interests, economic, strategic and so on, built up by the racist South African settlers in direct association with their powerful Western allies, primarily the United States of America along with other countries of NATO, and Israel.

206. These interests, which are essentially colonialist and imperialist, represented by the powerful transnational corporations, are indeed carrying on feverishly the pillage of the natural and human resources of Namibia and thus maintaining the Namibian people under foreign domination. To perpetuate this domination, the Pretoria régime in Namibia is practising a policy of "divide and rule" by setting up puppet institutions and organizations and by resorting to military conscription, thereby forcibly drafting Namibians into the colonial army in order to "Namibianize" the war against the Namibian people. But the most dangerous aspect and the most heinous aspect of the colonial policy of Pretoria in Namibia is the introduction into this Territory of the institutionalized racist system of *apartheid*, through which the whole of the indigenous population is rendered into virtual slavery; and methods of bantustanization have been introduced, on a par with Hitler's nazism, by forcing population groups to resettle, by regrouping tribal entities and ethnic entities, and by destroying the entire socio-economic structure of the Namibian nation.

207. In April 1983, my delegation had an opportunity to listen to the President of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and heard him, in the Security Council, excoriate the *apartheid* junta, which through all means wishes to maintain the illegal occupation of Namibia. My delegation could not help but recall the grimmest periods of the long war of resistance of the Vietnamese people against American imperialists. Indeed, those were similar adversaries, with matching criminal targets and virtually identical manoeuvres and plans of action. As in the case of South Viet Nam at the time, the enemy of the Namibian people is trying to find, at any cost, a way of turning Namibia into a neo-colony and thus transforming it into a vast garrison and an immense military base, which will serve as an infernal machine to perpetuate the illegal occupation of the country through repressive terror of the most atrocious sort, and a springboard for aggressive armed attacks against the front-line African States.

208. But the obstacle to the independence of Namibia is all the more tremendous in that Washington continues to throw in its lot with Pretoria. Did not President Reagan himself proclaim emphatically this strategic alliance by saying: "Can we abandon a country that is strategically essential to the free world in its production of minerals that we must all have?"*

209. In fact a militarily powerful South African régime is perfectly in keeping with the strategic interests, both regional and global, of the United States. That is why, together with Israel, the United States is increasing its military assistance to Pretoria and opening the door for the regime's acquisition of nuclear capability, thus leading to an increasing threat to peace and security in southern Africa and indeed throughout the world. At the same time, it is Washington itself that, up to now, has guaranteed political protection for Pretoria by exercising its veto against any Security Council resolution calling for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime.

210. The struggle of the Namibian people against South Africa's colonial yoke took a decisive turn when SWAPO was established in 1960 and rapidly—six years later—proceeded to the phase of armed resistance, with the creation of the People's Liberation Army for Namibia, in order to meet effectively the ferocious repression carried out by Pretoria's army. Indeed, this is an essential requirement for many liberation movements at a particular phase of their development, as a guarantee of their final victory. The legitimacy of the armed struggle of the Namibian people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence has in any case been emphasized on several occasions by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and has been emphatically stated in many resolutions of the General Assembly.

211. On behalf of the people of Viet Nam, we should like at this stage to share some thoughts with our brothers and sisters in Namibia.

212. In the first place, although oppressed peoples must as a last resort use armed struggle because of the blindness of their enemies in using violence and weapons against them, it is nevertheless useful that at the same time they should take up the struggle on other fronts, such as the political and diplomatic fronts. This is what Viet Nam has done. This is what friends are doing now in Central America and elsewhere. This is also what SWAPO has undertaken with admirable patience, in order to achieve an honourable cease-fire which would lead to the termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. However, as always, our enemies use diplomatic means for delaying purposes and diversionary purposes and as a way of bringing pressure to bear in the hope that they will obtain maximum concessions. This is what is happening at the present time in Central America, as well as in southern Africa and in

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

the Middle East. Indeed, we need only mention the attitude adopted by the United States Government in its conversations with the Nicaraguan Government with regard to the Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America [*A/39/562, annex*] or, for example, the warning issued during the course of the El Salvador talks to the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front calling on it to lay down its arms and accept a general amnesty. That is why all peoples must be in a position to negotiate from strength; they must be vigilant and constantly on their guard. In this regard, we welcome the position reaffirmed by SWAPO on 13 August last, to the effect that Pretoria should set a date to begin the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the only fair and acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia.

213. In the second place, my delegation wishes to emphasize the fact that the victory of oppressed peoples depends first and foremost on their own efforts in the struggle but at the same time it depends on support from their friends throughout the world. With regard to the importance of international solidarity for Namibia, the oppressed South African people themselves are called on to play a primary role. That is why the strengthening of the present struggle of the South African people and the ANC against the *apartheid* régime gives valuable support to the Namibian people. In the same way, greater awareness on the part of United States public opinion in order to increase pressure on the Reagan Administration so that it will renounce its negative policy of constructive engagement with regard to Pretoria, stop disguising the colonial nature of the issue by regarding it as an East-West conflict and stop the artificial linkage with the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola is of the greatest importance.

214. As was the case with the question of the policies of the *apartheid* régime, which was dealt with by the General Assembly last week, the question of Namibia demands that the international community, and particularly the United Nations, which has had direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory for 18 years, take positive and immediate action and no longer make mere exhortations or empty promises, as was stated by the President of the South West Africa People's Organization in the Security Council in April 1983.

215. It is indeed obvious that verbal condemnations are powerless to shake the obstinacy of the racist settlers of Pretoria and their protectors and accomplices. Repeated appeals made respectively by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as many outstanding international figures, have all been unanimous in emphasizing the need for concerted international action of a more energetic nature against Pretoria.

216. In this regard, it is for the Security Council, in the first place, to deal with the Namibian question firmly and to take full responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Council should establish a precise timetable for its implementation and keep the matter constantly before it until the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has been fully realized. It is time the Council considered the convening of a special meeting in order to discuss the means of overcoming the present deadlock. It must continue to encourage the Secretary-General in his good offices, while undertaking serious preparations for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

217. At the same time, it is essential that the community of nations reinforce its assistance in many forms—material, moral, political and military—to SWAPO and to the front-line States in order to help them to increase the strength of their resistance to Pretoria's repression and pressure of all sorts.

218. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has invariably given its complete understanding and militant solidarity to the just cause of the independence of Namibia. In August 1981, in receiving a mission of consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia in Viet Nam, my Government solemnly reaffirmed its position of principle of total support for the legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its only authentic and legitimate representative.

219. Here in the General Assembly, let my delegation reaffirm once again our unwavering support for the Namibian people, as well as our fervent wish for the rapid victory of their national liberation struggle.

220. Mr. OCHIENGHS-WELLBORN (Uganda): A few weeks ago, the United Nations Council for Namibia held a Symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle of the Namibian People against Colonialism. To the people of Namibia that marked a century of barbaric and brutal oppression, the denial of the most elementary human rights and the exploitation and plunder of their human and natural resources. This year also marks 100 years of heroic struggle against colonialism and oppression by the gallant people of Namibia. That struggle, today spearheaded by SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, continues to register victories against South Africa.

221. For the past several years, concerted efforts have been made to secure independence for Namibia. In spite of its adoption and universal recognition six years ago, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, still remains unimplemented. The Pretoria régime has continued to use every pretext to frustrate the implementation of that resolution. Negotiations have been held in the hope that, in spite of South Africa's known intransigence, those Western countries with massive economic and other ties with South Africa would use their leverage with it in favour of the independence of Namibia. It is regrettable that the United States, a member of the Western contact group, in pursuance of its policy of constructive engagement, instead prompted and encouraged racist South Africa to insist on the irrelevant and extraneous issue of the linkage of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola with the independence of Namibia.

222. Uganda continues to reject any further attempts to insist on linkage as a pre-condition of the independence of Namibia. We refuse to accept that the future of the Namibians should be sacrificed to selfish interests or on the altar of East-West rivalry. We maintain that the trading of a people's freedom and national independence is not only reprehensible

but immoral. I wish, therefore, to reiterate Uganda's position that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a matter between two independent and sovereign States. It has no relation whatsoever with the colonial situation in Namibia.

223. In the course of all the negotiations, SWAPO has continued to display considerable patience, flexibility and statesmanship. Even in the face of equivocation and prevarication, SWAPO has continued to express its readiness to sign a cease-fire immediately so that the implementation process can begin. In contrast, South Africa has strewn one obstacle after another in the path of dialogue, insisting on elements that have no bearing on the process envisaged in resolution 435 (1978). The contrasting attitudes of the two parties were demonstrated early this year in Lusaka, when South Africa failed to respond to SWAPO's offer to sign an immediate cease-fire.

224. Clearly, the Pretoria régime could not have demonstrated such brazen intransigence and duplicity if it had not enjoyed the encouragement and support of powerful friends which selfishly defend it in order to protect their own vested interests.

225. Aware that SWAPO would win any free and fair election held in Namibia under United Nations auspices, South Africa is more than ever determined to stall SWAPO's victory through the imposition of puppet political institutions. The latest attempt to regroup the internal quislings in the so-called Multi-Party Conference is clear proof that South Africa has no intention of complying with the letter and the spirit of the United Nations plan. On the contrary, it is seeking to circumvent the United Nations plan and to consolidate its illegal hold on the Territory of Namibia.

226. A serious aspect of the Namibian colonial situation is the formidable military machine which South Africa has built in Namibia. This has been accomplished through the creation of tribal armies, the recruitment of mercenaries and the introduction of compulsory military service for all male Namibians between the ages of 17 and 55. The objective of these measures is to divide the African patriots and to intimidate the population with a view to undercutting support for SWAPO inside Namibia.

227. South Africa has also continued to use the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States. The racist forces still occupy the southern part of Angola and continue to prop up the renegade forces of Savimbi. It has embarked on a systematic programme of political and economic destabilization of the front-line States, aimed at forcing them to withdraw support for the liberation struggle.

228. The policies pursued by racist South Africa and its continued occupation and militarization of Namibia are a threat to international peace and security and consequently call for decisive action by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

229. The natural resources of Namibia are being plundered, in total contravention of Decree No. 1.[1] The United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations have often highlighted the callous disregard of the legitimate interests of the Namibian people by transnational corporations from certain Western countries. Such activities, coupled with the policies of co-operation and friendship with South Africa, only lend legitimacy to and encourage South Africa's occupation of Namibia and must be condemned. In this connection, Uganda denounces the opening of foreign consulates in occupied Namibia under any pretext whatsoever. It is therefore imperative to call upon those Western countries to desist from frustrating the United Nations efforts towards the independence of Namibia.

230. There has in fact been a dramatic intensification of the propaganda emanating from Pretoria and certain Western capitals to the effect that the consultations in the region are well on their way and will consequently lead to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The real situation has been clarified by the President of the People's Republic of Angola in a communication he addressed to the Secretary-General [*A/39/688*]. He makes it clear that, in spite of the flexibility and political will displayed by Angola to reach an amicable solution to the related problems and to achieve immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), racist South Africa has continued to pursue contrary policies. We in Uganda continue to support Angola's firm position on its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

231. We maintain that Namibia remains the unique responsibility of the United Nations and that resolution 435 (1978) is non-negotiable and the only acceptable basis for a settlement. We reject any attempt or attempts by South Africa and its backers to hijack the central role of the United Nations in the decolonization of that Territory. The Security Council should therefore immediately shoulder its responsibility to implement its plan regarding that Territory.

232. I wish also to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence, which has discharged its responsibilities with a sense of deep commitment and competence. Although the degree to which the Council can make an effective impact on the daily lives of the Namibian people is circumscribed by factors beyond its control, my delegation notes with satisfaction that the work done by the Council to promote the interests of Namibia and its oppressed people in preparation for independence and to mobilize international opinion concerning the cause of justice in Namibia has been enormous. In this connection, my delegation pays a special tribute to Mr. Paul Lusaka, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their untiring efforts and dedication in preparing Namibia for nationhood. Our appreciation goes equally to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari.

233. In conclusion, I wish to commend the front-line States for the steadfast support they have given to the liberation struggle in southern Africa in spite of the heavy odds they face. I also take this opportunity to reaffirm the solidarity of the Government and people of Uganda with the people of Namibia in their just struggle for independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

234. Mr. NGONDA (Zambia): In 1966, the General Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia because, as the record clearly shows, Pretoria had—as it is still doing today—systematically violated the letter and the

spirit of that Mandate it assumed in 1920 for the sole and unambiguous purpose of advancing the well-being of the inhabitants of that Territory.

235. Subsequent resolutions and decisions by the General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations, which sought to achieve the same objective defined in resolution 2145 (XXI), have to all intents and purposes come to naught because successive racist régimes in South Africa have resorted to every conceivable trick in the book to stifle the will of the international community.

236. The net effect of South Africa's negative attitude is that Namibia stands out, as my Minister for Foreign Affairs stated during the general debate [*11th meeting*], as a blot and aberration in an otherwise virtually complete decolonization process in Africa. Thus, in Namibia today, the hallowed principle of the self-determination of countries and peoples, a principle which the United Nations has reaffirmed from time to time, continues to be trampled upon with sickening regularity and impunity by the racist Pretoria régime.

237. It is against this background of increasing South African intransigence that the annual debate on the question of Namibia's independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is taking place.

238. There is certainly no evidence to suggest South Africa's willingness to withdraw and end its illegal occupation of Namibia. Available evidence demonstrates very clearly that Namibia is, in fact, a bastion of South Africa, with more than 100,000 racist troops and mercenaries in the Territory, who continue, in their usual trigger-happy fashion, to slaughter countless Namibians. The latest decision by the racists to conscript all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve in the very army of occupation which has brought untold suffering to the Namibian people is incontestible evidence of South Africa's sinister design to persist in its illegal occupation and exploitation of Namibia, which has been the victim of foreign domination and exploitation for the past 100 years.

239. The implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia has not been proceeded with, but not for any reason which can be attributed to SWAPO or to the front-line States. The plan has not been implemented because South Africa and certain of its allies continue to create obstacles in an effort to scuttle that plan. It is a fact that over the years South Africa has made desperate attempts to sidestep the plan by working out schemes designed to exclude SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the oppressed people of Namibia, from participation in any electoral process. The racists have preferred internal settlements with puppet groups, because those groups have neither the vision nor the desire to promote and safeguard the interests of their country and people.

240. The Pretoria régime, which has extended its evil system of *apartheid* to Namibia, has no desire whatsoever to end its illegal occupation of Namibia because, apart from its incredible appetite for continuing to exploit the human resources of that beleaguered country, it plans to continue to use the Territory as a springboard for launching acts of aggression against independent countries of our region in an effort to blunt our support for the heroic struggle which the oppressed are waging to dismantle the citadel of injustice in South Africa itself. South Africa's insensitivity to the chorus of demands that it end its illegal occupation of Namibia is a function, in no small measure, of the unparalleled moral, diplomatic and material support it continues to enjoy from certain Western countries. Specifically, the United States' constructive engagement policy, coupled with the decision to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, has had the undesirable effect of encouraging the racist and neo-Fascist Pretoria régime to maintain its defiant and hostile posture in relation to any and all efforts designed to accelerate progress along the road to freedom and independence in Namibia. The international community has rightly rejected the linkage issue and all attempts by South Africa and its allies to portray the Namibian people's quest for independence as an East-West issue in the context of super-Power rivalry. Namibians are waging a just struggle to achieve their freedom and independence. That struggle deserves the fullest support of the international community.

241. There can be no doubt that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and decisions, is a serious challenge and an insult to the Organization. The international community has an inescapable duty not to remain passive in the face of this insult and challenge.

242. As we prepare to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, it is the hope, indeed, the expectation, of the oppressed people of Namibia, who have reposed so much confidence and trust in this world body, that a very clear message will this time be sent to the racists to compel them to end their illegal occupation of Namibia. We have an obligation to continue to uphold the lofty principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. We should not fail the oppressed people of Namibia.

243. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): The stalemate in the Namibian crisis presents a situation whose consequences constantly endanger the peace and security of the southern African region. This is because the Pretoria régime has refused to comply with the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations with regard to the liberation of the Namibian people and their aspiration to freedom and national independence.

244. It is 18 years now since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and took over the direct responsibility of the administration of that Territory with a view to assisting the Namibian people to attain a peaceful transition to genuine independence. A few months later, the General Assembly, by resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, established the United Nations Council for Namibia and entrusted to it—rightly—the responsibility of administering the Namibian Territory, with a clear mandate to defend the rights and interests of the Namibian people until they achieve genuine national independence.

245. Unhappy with that transfer of mandate and bent on its unjustified intention to cling to Namibian territory, the South African régime refused to submit to the wish of the international community to free Namibia and persisted in imposing its colonial policy of illegal occupation on the Territory. Indeed, since

then all actions emanating from the South African régime have clearly demonstrated its evil intention of blocking all prospects of achieving self-determination and genuine independence for the Namibian people.

246. The South African régime, determined to consolidate its colonial policy of domination and to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibian territory, embarked on a massive military build-up, carrying out massive military operations throughout the Territory and beyond its borders to intimidate the Namibian people and the front-line States. It employed repressive methods of arbitrary arrest and torture of civilian detainees. It imprisoned and executed political prisoners and freedom fighters, in defiance and flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

247. It is obvious that in these circumstances the South African régime invited perpetual tension and confrontation in that region. Alarmed at South Africa's inhuman policy of occupation and colonial domination of Namibian territory, the international community has repeatedly condemned and declared that policy null and void. At the same time, it has stood fast by the Namibian people and firmly supported their courageous struggle to achieve complete independence.

248. We believe very strongly—and history will prove—that no matter how strong South Africa is or appears to be, with its massive military machinery and other related repressive apparatus, the reign of terror, brutality and torture by the South African régime over the Namibian population will never suppress or stifle the courage and determination of the Namibian people and their liberation movement, SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, to win their struggle for genuine independence.

249. Nevertheless, it has been very painful to realize that the political, economic and military activities of the racist régime of South Africa and its allies have proved able to undermine the efforts and frustrate the aspirations of the Namibian people to protect their territorial integrity, freedom, natural resources and independence. We do not condone the policy of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa against the wish of the struggling people of Namibia and their liberation movement. We are convinced that that policy undermines the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people and the black majority of South Africa for their freedom and national independence.

250. We see no justification whatsoever for the continued illegal occupation by South Africa of Namibian territory. We reject the presence of the South African armed forces of occupation and the illegal administrative machinery, which should be withdrawn from Namibian territory.

251. The brutal repression by the South African régime of the Namibian people, the persistent violation of their human rights, the exploitation and depletion of the mineral and other natural resources of the Territory and the illegal use of Namibian territory as a springboard for attacks on and efforts to destabilize independent neighbouring States of southern Africa must be condemned and stopped.

252. The international community must exert every possible effort to give adequate moral, financial and material support to the liberation front of the Namibian people to counter South African aggression and to enable them to carry on their liberation struggle until they achieve genuine independence.

253. We are gratified that the United Nations expressed its will, through the Security Council, to arrest the intransigence of the South African régime and to bring about a peaceful settlement in the area by adopting resolution 435 (1978), which carefully sets forth the basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.

254. This resolution has won world-wide recognition and has been accepted as a genuine basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question because of its careful plan for a democratic election in Namibia under United Nations supervision. It invites the South African régime to co-operate with the United Nations in the effort to prepare the people of Namibia for their independence through legally supervised, democratic elections. We are greatly concerned, however, that despite the concerted efforts exerted by the international community, the election plan has yet to be implemented, six years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), because the South African régime has chosen to frustrate all peace efforts and has deliberately rejected any responsibility for reaching a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. The South African régime has used every trick to gain time for its manoeuvres and delaying tactics, designed to perpetuate its domination over the Namibian people and further exploit and plunder the natural resources of their land, in violation of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, as well as of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[1]

255. Moreover, the establishment by the South African régime of the pre-condition of an unrelated linkage has made it impossible to implement the United Nations plan to resolve the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

256. It is very regrettable that, while the international community continues to appeal to South Africa to comply with resolution 435 (1978), which provides the only valid basis for achieving a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, South Africa continues to step up its brutal methods of repression and intimidation by extending its obnoxious system of *apartheid* and its policy of bantustanization to Namibian territory. In addition to its regular army of occupation, South Africa has reverted to reliance on the massive recruitment of mercenary forces, which are deployed throughout the Territory and across the borders to stifle the growing resistance of the liberation struggle in the Territory. Recent reports have also indicated that the South African régime has extended compulsory military service to the local population. This latest manoeuvre has forced a considerable number of the Namibian people to flee into exile rather than submit to the colonial strategy of setting Namibian soldiers against their own people.

257. The encroachments of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa have not been limited to Namibian and South African territory, but have gone beyond these borders. The South African régime has repeatedly intimidated and waged war against the neighbouring front-line States so as to destabilize them, disrupt their economic and social structure and thus prevent them from extending support to the courageous people of Namibia, the black majority of South

Africa and their liberation movements. The Pretoria régime could not have sustained its defiant acts of repression and aggression against the southern African States had it not been encouraged by the collaboration of the transnational corporations protected by certain Member countries which, for the sake of selfish gains and short-term interests, have jeopardized the right of the Namibian and South African people to self-determination and national independence, thus endangering the peace and security of the entire region.

258. We believe that any economic and financial collaboration with the South African régime will only increase the aggressive and repressive capacity of the *apartheid* régime further to intensify its brutal repression of and colonial domination over the oppressed Namibian and other southern African people.

259. At this point, the delegation of Djibouti would like to pay a tribute to the brave Namibian people, who, against the odds, have shown great courage in their heroic liberation struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

260. My delegation also expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the experienced and competent leadership of Mr. Lusaka of Zambia, has fulfilled the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly and discharged its responsibilities with diligence, in defence of the rights and interests of the Namibian people, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. We are very happy to commend the tireless efforts of the Council in mobilizing concerted international support and action to promote the Namibian cause and to bring an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. We express our confidence that the persistent endeavours of the Council will augment the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and national independence. In this regard, my delegation is pleased to concur with the conclusions of the Council as set out in its report and expresses its full support for its recommendations [*A/39/24, part four, chap I*].

261. The international community must exert the utmost effort to reject all measures by the South African racist régime and its allies aimed at blocking the ongoing peace efforts in United Nations forums and at the regional, sub-regional and interregional levels to achieve independence for Namibia. We believe that any negotiations in the search for a political solution in Namibia should strive for a complete and simultaneous cease-fire, followed by the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's occupying forces from the Territory, so as to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

262. The search for genuine peace requires that effective leverage be applied, if constructive results are to be achieved. In this regard, we firmly believe that it is a primary responsibility of the Security Council—the sole international peace-keeping apparatus of the Organization—to reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence, and accordingly to achieve the essential objective of guaranteeing the long overdue independence of Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

263. The Security Council has been repeatedly advised, in the face of South Africa's defiance in rejecting all United Nations resolutions and decisions, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against it, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Such sanctions should include an arms embargo, an oil embargo, economic sanctions and other suitable measures as referred to in General Assembly resolutions ES-8/2 and 36/121 B.

264. We cherish the hope that the chronic lack of unanimity in the deliberations of the Security Council and the consequent absence of decisive action to settle the Namibian question will be redressed, and that all Governments will one day—very soon—comply with the provisions on the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions in Chapter VII of the Charter as regards the South African régime.

265. We believe that only through the application of such sanctions will the South African régime be compelled to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia.

266. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 28 October 1983 the Security Council adopted resolution 539 (1983), by which, among other things, the Security Council reiterated that resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the United Nations plan for Namibia, was the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. It also affirmed that the electoral system to be used for the elections of the Constituent Assembly should be determined prior to the adoption by the Security Council of the enabling resolution for the implementation of the United Nations plan. It called upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to communicate to him its choice of electoral system in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). The Council expressed its indignation that South Africa's insistence on an irrelevant and extraneous issue of "linkage" had obstructed the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), just as it has obstructed implementation of other Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on Namibia.

Mr. Farah Dirir (Djibouti), Vice-President, took the Chair.

267. In his further report to the Security Council[12] in compliance with its resolution 539 (1983), the Secretary-General deplored the lack of progress in his conversations with South Africa, which had given him no positive response on its choice of electoral system to facilitate the implementation of the United Nations plan. There were 14 votes, including that of our delegation, in favour of the resolution. The United States abstained. We ask ourselves whether South Africa's attitude to the resolution would have been the same if that permanent member had acted differently, voting in favour of the resolution. A positive vote by the United States would have been possible only if that country were truly a champion of human rights, equality and respect for the right of peoples to independence and self-determination.

268. As on other occasions, the abstention by the United States was a manifestation of its policy of constructive engagement, but "engagement" by whom and "constructive" for whom?

269. The engagement is certainly not with the suffering people of Namibia or the South African

people. Rather, it is with the Pretoria Government, resulting only in the consolidation and institutionalization of the shameful *apartheid* system and the policy of aggression practised by South Africa against its neighbours.

270. The international community, including even those countries that support South Africa because they believe that the racist régime protects their economic, political and strategic interests, is aware that the racist régime will never cease of its own accord its illegal occupation of Namibia.

271. Over the past four decades, the racist régime has continued to entrench its illegal occupation. We must emphasize the illegal nature of that occupation, because the use of force does not make illegal actions legal. That has been clearly stated in resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly and in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,[8] delivered in response to the request addressed to it by the Security Council in its resolution 284 (1970) of 29 July 1970.

272. The total lack of respect on the part of South Africa for the legal framework of the United Nations and its principal organ with regard to international law—that is, the International Court of Justice—is similar to the attitude adopted by this protecting super-Power, which this year has used every type of manoeuvre and subterfuge to evade its responsibilities with regard to international law. Another manifestation of the total lack of respect for the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, as well as for Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, is the establishment of the so-called Liaison Office of the United States in Windhoek.

273. The President of the United States, in referring to my country almost two years ago, said that our neighbours ran the risk of being contaminated by us. Over the 45 years of the dictatorship of Somoza, the Government of the United States was not much concerned by the fact that the neighbours of Nicaragua could have been contaminated by that dictatorship. Today, it is no more concerned by the fact that the Pretoria régime is imposing the inhuman system of *apartheid* beyond its boundaries through its illegal occupation of Namibia.

274. This export of *apartheid* began in 1955, when the South African Government implemented that policy officially in Namibia, and was entrenched between 1966 and 1976, when the racist régime extended the *apartheid* legislation to Namibia. Thus the Terrorism Act of 1975 was applied to Namibia, and thus the constitutional conference controlled by the white majority was established. The so-called Proclamation AG 8, of 24 April 1980, divided the country into mutually exclusive racial and tribal groups. As far as housing is concerned, laws have been applied which stem from *apartheid*, as for example the Native Urban Areas Proclamation of 1951, which applies in the urban zones. Namibians in the urban centres of their own country live in areas separate from the whites and the Coloureds. The health service is organized in a different way according to whether it concerns whites or blacks; there are special hospitals and dispensaries for blacks, which have to inform the South African Defence Force of all cases of gunshot wounds.

275. The racist régime also makes a distinction between expenditure on health depending on whether it is dealing with the black or the white population. The latter, as under nearly all the headings of the national budget, receives a disproportionately high allocation.

276. *Apartheid* has also had its effect on the education programme, in the salaries of teachers, investments per student, the ratio of teachers to students and the establishment of separate schools.

277. The repression of the South African and the Namibian peoples by the racist régime is practised through a system of terror. In both South Africa and Namibia, detention, arbitrary arrest, torture and assassination are part of daily life. The statement made by Mr. Toivo ya Toivo at one of the solemn meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia to commemorate the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, SWAPO, was very moving. Mr. Toivo ya Toivo, one of the bravest sons of Africa and Namibia, who recovered his liberty after 16 years of unjust detention, said among other things:

> "I am out of gaol but I am not free. I will feel free only when my country and my people are truly free. That day is not yet here. Instead, down the road I still see before me a long and bitter struggle. Nevertheless, I remain confident today as I was in 1968 when I said the struggle would be long and bitter, but my people would wage that struggle whatever the cost."[13]

278. History has shown how true the words of Mr. Toivo ya Toivo were, because the aspirations to freedom of the oppressed cannot be denied forever by those whose principal—indeed, only—weapons are violence, oppression and force.

279. The co-operation of certain Western Powers, particularly the United States, with the inhuman régime of *apartheid* only prolongs and makes more bitter the struggle to which Mr. Toivo ya Toivo referred. The *apartheid* régime has felt strengthened by the increased economic, political, military and nuclear co-operation of, in particular, the United States.

280. My delegation will welcome the day when it does not have to vote on resolutions in which the name of the United States appears. In the particular case of Namibia, this would mean that the United States, breaking out of its isolation within the international community, was offering its support for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It would also mean the withdrawal of the military, economic and political support that today it gives to the most shameful system in the world, that of *apartheid*. Those who would rejoice most at this change of attitude would be the people of Namibia, because they would benefit most from the disappearance of one of the main obstacles to the full exercise of the right to independence and freedom. However, until that day dawns, we must stand firm and firmly maintain our position of assigning the guilt and naming the guilty party. We are convinced that the great majority of the international community will act in the same way.

281. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which Nicaragua has been a member since the overthrow of the Somoza régime, is happy to count SWAPO among its members and as a full member. The Movement, which is based on the principles of opposition to racism, colonialism and imperialism, gives its full solidarity and support to the Namibian people and their sole and legitimate representative,

SWAPO. In the Final Communiqué adopted by the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984 [*see A/39/560, annex*] that support and solidarity was reaffirmed. In that Communiqué the Movement expressed its indignation at the continued non-implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also condemned and rejected the persistent attempts by the present United States Administration and by South Africa to obstruct the implementation of that plan by their insistence on a linkage and parallelism between the independence of Namibia and extraneous and irrelevant issues, in particular the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. The Ministers also called on the Security Council to meet and to assume fully its responsibilities by taking urgent action to implement its decisions, if necessary by the adoption of mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

282. It is clear that South Africa has not given any indication of a change in its attitude or policy or, for that matter, with regard to its constant and repeated violations of United Nations resolutions and decisions.

283. My Government, therefore, unreservedly supports the view that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter is the only way to ensure that South Africa will respect United Nations resolutions and decisions, as set out in the draft resolutions submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

284. Finally, we take this opportunity to express also our gratitude for the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the wise and effective leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, and to reiterate our will and determination to continue to give our support to any actions which will further the just cause of the independence of Namibia.

285. Mr. [illegible]LLA (Philippines): The question of Namibia stands out as the one issue on the agenda that may well serve as the litmus test for the United Nations.

286. On 27 October 1966, by resolution 2145 (XXI), we, the Members of the United Nations, decided to place under our direct responsibility the Territory of Namibia. A year later, we decided to exercise this direct responsibility through the United Nations Council for Namibia, to enable the people of the Territory to enjoy their right to self-determination and to achieve genuine national independence.

287. That was 18 long years ago. Today, Namibia and its people are still in the cruel and vice-like grip of the racist Pretoria régime. How could we have assumed such responsibility, and almost by wilful default—sometimes through perverse acts—failed to discharge it? I address myself in particular to those nations which took part in that fateful decision 18 years ago, but whose subsequent actions plainly contravened the very essence of that decision, which was to enable the Namibian people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and the achievement of genuine national independence. Through their lack of co-operation in effectively isolating South Africa, they encourage the racist régime in Pretoria to continue its blatant defiance of United Nations resolutions and measures designed to solve the Namibian problem.

288. Like many countries here represented, the Philippines has its own history of struggle for independence. Our people know by heart how difficult and painful it is to be subjugated by a foreign Power. It is for this reason that we identify very closely with the aspirations of the people of Namibia. It is also for this reason that my country, in the person of our venerable former Foreign Minister, General Carlos P. Rómulo, fought an uphill battle for the inclusion of the words "or independence" in Article 76 b of the Charter of the United Nations, concerning the trusteeship system.

289. Today, my delegation wishes to reiterate its unequivocal support for Namibia's independence, and we call upon all States Members of the United Nations to support the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other resolutions we have adopted on the subject. My Government firmly opposes the moves of the South African authorities to impose puppet political institutions in the Territory in an obvious attempt to settle the problem internally. It is we, the Members of this Organization, and no one else—certainly not South Africa—who have the sole and direct responsibility of solving the problem in a manner which we perceive to be in the best interest of the oppressed people of Namibia.

290. My delegation also reiterates at this time its support for the imposition of sanctions and other enforcement measures against South Africa to force it to comply with all the relevant resolutions and decisions concerning Namibia. In this connection, my delegation is fully aware of the dedicated work of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory. To Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, in his capacity as President of the Council, and to the Council members, we extend our appreciation and felicitation.

291. Next year we shall celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Organization. What could be a more fitting way to celebrate the occasion than to give substance to our avowed commitment to the principles of self-determination and independence for all nations—yes, by giving birth to an independent Namibia.

292. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again we meet to consider the situation in Namibia, which has become a perennial item on the agenda of the sessions of the General Assembly, the OAU, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and, indeed, all international forums.

293. The fact that, in the general debate of the thirty-ninth session, numerous speakers took up this item bears witness to the importance the international community attaches to this subject.

294. Unfailingly, at any meeting where the matter is considered, the international community has consistently condemned linkage and has qualified it as a racist pretext to prevent Namibia from acceding to independence.

295. In a new contribution to peace, Angola transmitted a letter to the Secretary-General from President José Eduardo dos Santos [*A/39/688*], in which he set out in a precise, objective, reasonable and constructive manner a set of proposals to pave the way for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and thereby allow Namibia to

achieve its independence. Cuba supports these proposals presented by Angola. What more can be expected of Angola? Angola has suffered a cruel war waged by the UNITA[11] bands because of the financial and logistical support of, and training by, South Africa and some of its allies. Racist South African troops are still trampling underfoot the soil of the southern part of Angola.

296. And how does South Africa respond? With the defiance, arrogance and contempt so characteristic of its leaders and its policy. Mr. Botha's letter sets out new conditions, which lead us to believe that South Africa's disdain for the international community is overriding. It shows that Pretoria has no real desire to reach an agreement that would ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and would thus lead to independence for Namibia and peace in the area. South Africa wants only one form of peace, *pax apartheid*, under which Namibia would remain under its domination and Angola would no longer be what it is: a free and sovereign State.

297. Why does South Africa behave in this way? Why does it mock and deride the clamouring of peoples and States? There is a clear answer: because it feels that it has greater support than ever before from the architects of the so-called policy of constructive engagement. Let us look at the debates in the Security Council, and we shall see that it is they who have vetoed draft resolutions condemning South Africa. It is they who, in the Fourth Committee during this session, submitted amendments to ensure that the names of the country in question and Israel would not appear in the draft resolutions relating to South Africa. It is they who have presented further amendments calling for the deletion of their names from draft resolutions on Namibia that are to be voted upon by this Assembly.

298. What kind of respect is shown for the African peoples and the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, who met from 12 to 15 November 1984 at Addis Ababa at the twentieth ordinary session of their Assembly, and examined the situation in southern Africa, and Namibia in particular, in accordance with the spirit and letter of the draft resolutions on this item? How can we ask the members of the OAU to delete from the draft resolution on Namibia the name of those who support the Namibian people's oppressors, who, thanks to this encouragement, have become increasingly brutal and arrogant? How can they be asked to delete the name of those who collaborate with Israel so that South Africa is able to develop its military technology, including nuclear technology? How can they be asked to delete the name of those who enable the transnational corporations to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in South African industries, who make it possible for the IMF and the World Bank to grant huge loans to the racist South Africans? In my delegation's opinion, these draft resolutions should be adopted by acclamation. In so doing, we shall pay a tribute to the heroic sons of Namibia, to SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, and to the Heads of State and Government of Africa.

299. Throughout this statement we have referred to those who invented the so-called constructive engagement, to those who thought up and have advocated linkage, to those who veto in the Security Council draft resolutions against South Africa, despite the fact that the racist police assassinated 87 black citizens, with impunity. So far, we have not mentioned the name of that country. We believe that it is more than well known that it is the United States Government which combines all these characteristics that have such a negative effect on the people of Namibia and the African peoples in general.

300. Mr. AL-BOAININ (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In 1966, the General Assembly decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over what was then known as South-West Africa. Despite this, South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia continues today, in complete defiance of the will of the international community and in total disregard for international law and the right of peoples to self-determination. The many resolutions that have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council since then have all been to no avail. This has been true despite the economic sanctions imposed by most countries of the world against South Africa, in compliance with United Nations resolutions.

301. My country therefore supports the recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24, part four, chap. I*]. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution proposed by the Council on the situation resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa as well as the draft resolution it proposes on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

302. My delegation takes this opportunity to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their efforts. We pay a tribute also to the Department of Public Information for its efforts to support the struggle of the Namibian people by disseminating information and mobilizing international public opinion in support of Namibia. In this connection, my delegation welcomes the idea of convening, at United Nations Headquarters in 1985, an international conference in which eminent persons, scholars, members of support groups and mass media personnel from all over the world would participate, in order to mobilize and promote more international support for the just struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the heroic Namibian people.

303. The Government of Qatar has discharged, in word as well as in deed, what it considers to be a legal and moral obligation. Thus, in 1973 it enacted Decree No. 130, which imposed economic sanctions against South Africa, in compliance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Decree provided for an oil embargo against South Africa. My country also enacted in 1973 Decree No. 140, under which it severed all cultural, trade and economic relations with South Africa.

304. The Government of Qatar, in co-operation with its Arab sister countries, is seeking to consolidate the embargo against South Africa through the adoption of more effective arrangements designed to eliminate the loopholes and the attempts to evade the embargo resolutions, to which my country is committed in letter and in spirit. The mass media in Qatar spare no effort in publicizing the violations of human rights in Namibia and in exposing the racist régime's false propaganda designed to deceive world public opinion. In this regard, my delegation cannot fail to express its regret at the fact that some States do not seriously implement economic sanctions against

South Africa, and this supports South Africa in its continued illegal occupation. It encourages South Africa to persist in its denial of the rights of the Namibian people and its defiance of United Nations resolutions aimed at achieving independence for Namibia.

305. Regrettably, the racist régime in Pretoria was encouraged to persist in blocking the implementation of United Nations resolutions and preventing the United Nations Council for Namibia from shouldering its responsibilities in the Territory when one of the permanent members of the Security Council used its right of veto in August 1981. My delegation calls upon all Member States to bow to the will of the international community and to support, rather than impede, the efforts aimed at achieving the independence of Namibia, so that the last remnants of colonialism may be eliminated from the African continent and future efforts may be crowned with success, following the unfortunate failure of the talks on Namibia's independence held in Lusaka and Mindelo earlier this year.

306. Mr. ALAUKLI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Arab Libyan people believe that the Namibian question and the question of the dignity of Africa are indissolubly linked. That is why we have always believed that the Namibian problem and the presence of the racist régime in South Africa is a priority matter on two levels—the international and the African—especially since the problems of liberation, independence and recovered dignity of the African and Arab peoples are cardinal features of our foreign policy.

307. On the basis of this position of principle, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya feels compelled to share all the commitments of every African country and has always provided encouragement and assistance to SWAPO, as well as to the African front-line States. We have, moreover, demonstrated publicly that we consider ourselves to be a front-line State by prohibiting direct or indirect collaboration of any kind with the *apartheid* régime.

308. The position of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya with regard to the Namibian question is based on our position with respect to the theocratic régime in occupied Arab Palestine. Indeed, the Namibian and South African peoples and the Palestinian people are the victims of attacks on, respectively, their African and Arab identity. Indeed, Arab and African dignity is the subject of repeated assaults because of the existence of racist entities with common ideologies and with complementary rules, accomplices in the establishment of a single strategy for entrenching hegemony by oppressing the Arab and African peoples.

309. The similarity of the threats facing these two peoples caused them to realize from the outset the indivisibility of that infernal trio, that three-faced enemy: racism, zionism and imperialism. The final document adopted by the first Arab-African summit, which was held in the Egyptian capital in March 1977, reaffirmed this indivisible link. The document contained a group of principles which are the basis of the common struggle against the régimes of racism and racial discrimination in occupied Palestine and in South Africa, régimes and policies that extend to Namibia, as well as to Arab and African front-line States. This document constitutes the springboard of the Arab-African common struggle, and also indicates a judicious historical choice, namely, open war against a situation in which Arab and African men and women suffer constantly. The document also affirms the close link between the challenges facing the Arab and the African peoples, which make it inevitable that they close ranks and strengthen their struggle.

310. First, in South Africa and Namibia and in occupied Palestine, there are settlements of foreigners who have made a doctrine of racial discrimination and who deny the indigenous population its right to self-determination and plunder their natural resources.

311. Secondly, in South Africa and Namibia, as well as in occupied Palestine, an expansionist policy has been adopted as an instrument for the implementation of the hegemonistic plans which have become the official ideology of these racist régimes at the expense of the rights of the indigenous peoples and on the pretext of security and the suppression of terrorism.

312. Thirdly, in South Africa and in occupied Palestine, there is a trend which runs counter to civilization and history, because these régimes believe that their only chance of survival lies in the application of force. That is the reason for the collaboration between them in all areas, the military and nuclear fields in particular, with the aim of intimidating the peoples of these regions and forcing them to capitulate.

313. Fourthly, the Zionist entity and racist régime of Pretoria are trying to defy United Nations resolutions by imposing partial solutions that ignore international legality. The solution proposed by South Africa to the question of Namibia very strongly resembles the Zionist thesis concerning Palestinian autonomy. Indeed, the South African attempts against the African front-line States resemble the attempts to impose the Camp David accords on the Arab homeland.

314. Fifthly, the implementation of the Zionist project in the Arab homeland and the imposition of the racist régime of Pretoria in the southern part of the African continent represent a new page in the history of colonialism, aimed at perpetuating illegal exploitation. Indeed, through the Zionist threat and the aggressive policies of the Pretoria régime, there is intensive pillaging of Arab and African natural resources and human potential.

315. Sixthly, the generous assistance provided by the United States is one of the principal factors making it possible for the two racist régimes to defy the will of the international community. The so-called constructive engagement between the United States and the racist régime of Pretoria is no different from the strategic co-operation between the United States Administration and the Zionist entity.

316. All this reveals the true nature of the challenge to the Arab and African peoples, which makes it essential that they unify their efforts and close their ranks in order to struggle against the last bastion of racism, exploitation and aggression.

317. For nearly 40 years now the United Nations has been dealing with the Namibian question, and it is more than 18 years since the General Assembly adopted the resolution ending the South African Mandate over Namibia. It is six years since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), by which it approved the United Nations plan for the

independence of Namibia. In spite of the passage of time, the large number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and all the efforts made so far, we have unfortunately not yet succeeded in shaking the racist régime of Pretoria, which continues to defy the will of the international community.

318. My delegation, when it studied the reports presented by the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and listened to the statements made by the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization and the spokesmen of the African front-line States was confirmed in its conviction that the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has reached a critical point. That imposes upon the international community the need to adopt practical measures to compel the racist régime of Pretoria to comply with the international will.

319. The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that any delay in the implementation of these measures would only speed up the implementation of the South African plan, which South Africa is trying to substitute for the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

320. The racist Pretoria régime has decided to implement a so-called internal solution by establishing fictitious institutions, such as councils of State and multi-party national conferences, by applying a policy of forced militarization of the Namibian people aimed at strengthening the occupation forces, by forming tribal armies, by establishing military posts and by refusing to recognize SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Pretoria is following a repressive policy based on violation of human rights. This demonstrates that it is still resolved to bypass the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This makes it necessary to implement the provisions of Security Council resolution 439 (1978), which warned the Pretoria régime that if it did not co-operate with the Security Council in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the Security Council would meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the two aforementioned resolutions.

321. It is high time the Security Council honoured its own decision. Nothing can justify delay in the implementation of these resolutions, especially since all the parties have recognized that, although SWAPO has shown a great sense of responsibility, Pretoria has shown greater intransigence and has attempted to introduce new elements that were not included in resolution 435 (1978), in an attempt to impose a new *fait accompli* which would make it possible for South Africa to perpetuate its domination and occupation of Namibia and illegally plunder the natural resources of Namibia, transforming that Territory into a link in the security belt surrounding South Africa, so that it can launch attacks against the African front-line States.

322. Many factors have encouraged the racist régime of Pretoria to continue to flout the will of the international community. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that the most important of those factors are the following.

323. First of all, this problem cannot be considered without taking into account the role of the United States, because to do so would mean ignoring the problem in its entirety. Indeed, the Reagan Administration has qualified the Pretoria régime as an "historical ally". It has also declared that, for economic and strategic reasons, southern Africa is one of the regions of vital interest to the United States.

324. Secondly, in view of the foregoing, the United States Administration's policy of constructive engagement with Pretoria is a sophisticated alliance in all fields, which has helped to strengthen South Africa's grip over Namibia in order to preserve the economic interests of the two allies in that Territory.

325. Thirdly, the pretext of the presence of Cuban forces in Angola to justify the continued occupation of Namibia has been concocted by the United States in order to link the Namibian problem with ideological questions and include it in the East-West conflict.

326. Fourthly, the United States Administration, certain other Western States and the Zionist entity have refused to comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), concerning the arms embargo against South Africa. These States are continuing to collaborate with Pretoria in the technical field, thus making it possible for South Africa to occupy Namibia and to destabilize the neighbouring countries.

327. Fifthly, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) endorsed the plan for the independence of Namibia proposed by the States of the so-called Western contact group. It was hoped that those same States would exert pressure on South Africa, but the reality of the past few years has been quite different. It seems that those States are much more concerned with having their multinational corporations exploit Namibian resources than with putting an end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

328. Sixthly, through hypocrisy, pressure and blackmail, South Africa has succeeded in temporarily throwing its opponents off guard, thereby advancing its own racist policies and theses.

329. That is how these various factors have combined and brought us to this situation. Hence, the international community must redouble its efforts so as to put an end to South Africa's delaying policies and manoeuvres, for any further delay in this matter would hold the United Nations hostage to the régime in Pretoria which seeks to upset the geopolitical facts of the problem through the imposition of its own solutions and through attempts at occupation of neighbouring African territories by overthrowing their régimes and replacing them with puppet governments.

330. As we have already pointed out, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that the Namibian problem is of concern to the African continent as a whole. That is why we have always helped the Namibian people in their struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO. We should like to emphasize the following points with regard to our position on the principles constituting a basis for a just solution of the problem.

331. First of all, to resolve the Namibian problem it is necessary to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia in its entirety. There can be no question of introducing any new elements that have nothing to do with the subject. We must not accept any substitute solutions outside

the framework of the United Nations which would be detrimental to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

332. Secondly, my country considers that SWAPO is the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and it recognizes no other artificial entity that might take away SWAPO's legitimacy. SWAPO continues to wage its heroic struggle, and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has decided to provide it with every form of assistance—political, military and material—so as to increase pressure on Pretoria and bring it to comply with the will of the Namibian people for liberation and independence.

333. Thirdly, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that the independence of Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations and calls for the convening of the Security Council and the adoption of effective measures to guarantee the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978), in conformity with the timetable which is provided for, thus speeding up Namibia's accession to independence and making it possible for its people to exercise sovereignty throughout the whole of the Territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

334. Fourthly, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that South Africa's stubbornness in refusing to comply with the international will requires us to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against it under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, since all attempts so far have not succeeded in compelling South Africa to withdraw from Namibia.

335. In conclusion, the Jamahiriya would like to thank the Secretary-General for his efforts to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Likewise, we wish to praise the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka, who is also President of the current session of the General Assembly. Those efforts have made it possible to promote international awareness of the true dimensions of the Namibian problem and the true nature of the policy of the racist régime of Pretoria.

336. My delegation takes this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, who was recently released after long years in Pretoria's gaols. He and some of his colleagues, who were also imprisoned, have emerged from this experience strengthened in their determination to pursue the struggle until the ultimate victory of their just cause.

337. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): Ever since its inception, the United Nations has been preoccupied by its principal task—not only making the world a safer place to live in, but also shaping the global human environment in such a way as to enable the collective genius of mankind better to serve man's yearning for freedom, justice and development. Of course, it cannot be claimed that the United Nations has succeeded in all the endeavours it has undertaken since its foundation nearly 40 years ago, but it can certainly be said that one of the areas of activity in which it has had a notable success is that of decolonization.

338. The various initiatives taken by the United Nations to enable the oppressed and exploited masses in colonial Territories to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence have led to the emancipation of literally hundreds of millions of people in Africa, Asia and Latin America. That there are today 159 States Members of the United Nations as compared to 51 at the time of the signing of the Charter in San Francisco is indeed eloquent testimony to the brilliant contribution the United Nations has made to the historical and progressive development of the national liberation struggle of peoples under colonial domination.

339. The otherwise proud record of the United Nations in the effort to bring about the emancipation of colonial peoples unfortunately remains incomplete as a result of the continued existence of colonial domination and racial oppression in the southern part of the African continent. As a result of the intransigence that continues to be displayed by the Pretoria régime, the issue currently being debated by the General Assembly under item 29 of its agenda—that is, the question of Namibia—has for a long time remained a familiar item of discussion, without any tangible results. Consequently, the suffering of the peoples of southern Africa continues, and peace and stability in the region as a whole remain in jeopardy.

340. It is unfortunate that a case as straightforward as that of Namibia should be deliberately rendered complex by the racist régime in Pretoria, for it is abundantly clear that no matter what South Africa does it cannot—I repeat, cannot—for ever frustrate the determined struggle of the people of Namibia to liberate their Territory from its colonial clutches.

341. Namibia does not belong to South Africa. It is a Territory that at one time fell into its hands by an accident of history, when, after the First World War, it was transferred to South Africa's trusteeship as a Mandated Territory. What South Africa should have done was follow the example of other colonial Powers with Mandated Territories and live up to its obligation to prepare the people of Namibia for control of their own destiny. However, what the racist régime did instead was betray a sacred trust given it by the international community by imposing an illegal occupation on Namibia, with all its attendant evils of racism, repression and the greedy exploitation of the resources of the Territory.

342. The racist Pretoria régime having proved totally impervious to earlier repeated attempts at persuading it to recognize its responsibilities not only to the people of Namibia but also to the entire international community, the United Nations had no alternative but to adopt in 1966 a decision to revoke the Mandate entrusted to South Africa by the League of Nations. That decision, it will be recalled, was endorsed in June 1971 by the International Court of Justice in an advisory opinion.[8]

343. Momentous though these decisions are, in terms both of content and of the degree of broad international support generated, the fact remains that the racist Pretoria régime continues characteristically to ignore them with impunity, as it has the many other decisions that preceded them. Indeed, Pretoria's reaction was to intensify its repression against the Namibian people, while at the same time adopting other illegal measures designed to bring about the further entrenchment of its illegal occupation of the Territory. Indeed, the more the flagrant and continued violations by the racist régime of the relevant decisions of the United Nations went unpunished, the more the Pretoria régime was encouraged in its misguided perception of its position and policies

with respect to the question of the independence of Namibia.

344. Thanks to the generous support of its friends and partners in the West, trade and investment were not only unaffected but, in some sectors, even registered dramatic increases. In connivance with the racist régime, foreign economic interests continued to plunder the resources of the Territory in spite of the international injunction declaring the resources of Namibia to be the inviolable heritage of its people. In the military and strategic spheres, overt and covert co-operation with South Africa have continued, to the point where that country can now be counted among those with advanced military industries. The effort to assist South Africa in developing and accelerating its nuclear potential cannot but be described as one of the tragedies of our time.

345. It was in September 1978 that the Security Council adopted its resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the independence plan for Namibia. As that resolution was a product of broad and serious consultations with all concerned, it was then hoped that the time had at last come when the agony and repression long endured by the heroic people of Namibia would end and the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence would be restored. However, over six years have now elapsed since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted and, not surprisingly, the racist régime in Pretoria has proved to be no more willing today than it has been in the past to honour its obligations. Resolution 435 (1978) has thus inevitably joined the ranks of countless other relevant resolutions which remain dead letters.

346. It has now become evident that those States Members of the Organization which, at the time of the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), expressed pessimism and warned that whatever signals South Africa was purported to have given that it would co-operate within the framework of the resolution were a mere trick designed to buy time have been vindicated. Indeed, I submit that the international community has been effectively hoodwinked by a handful of racists in Pretoria.

347. All the same, as if all the time wasted so far were not enough, the racist régime in Pretoria continues to pay lip service to resolution 435 (1978). Not long ago P. W. Botha declared to the South African Parliament that "South Africa remains committed to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as an independence plan for Namibia", but he went on to add that "the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is an absolute prerequisite".

348. The Pretoria régime has long recognized that the outcome of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) would not serve its neo-colonialist interests in Namibia and has from the outset been making frantic attempts to wriggle out of the deal by searching for pretexts. As the Assembly is fully aware of the South African catalogue of subterfuge, distortion and prevarication designed to scuttle the application of resolution 435 (1978), I do not find it necessary to burden it with a recapitulation. However, I should like to emphasize at this juncture that South Africa's so-called prerequisite for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)—that is, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola—is not only outrageous but an interference in the internal affairs of the sister Republic of Angola and far-fetched as well, since it is irrelevant and extraneous to the decolonization of Namibia. The linking of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola cannot but be seen as yet another transparent attempt by the Pretoria régime to find an excuse to torpedo the application of resolution 435 (1978). In this connection, my delegation would wish to express its satisfaction that the Security Council, in resolution 539 (1983), has rejected the linkage proposal insisted upon by South Africa and its partners as being clearly incompatible with the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia.

349. South Africa's audacity in rejecting co-operation with the United Nations in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) cannot be viewed in isolation from the so-called policy of constructive engagement *vis-à-vis* the Pretoria régime. If the policy of constructive engagement was meant, as claimed, to enable the United States Government to exert pressure on the racist régime in Pretoria and to find an alternative to the violence raging in the region by opening a path to change that builds rather than destroys, then the policy is, indeed, a failure. The Pretoria régime has certainly not become any more amenable to persuasion than it was before. It still occupies Namibia, and parts of southern Angola are also under its aggressive sway. Its destabilization efforts directed against the front-line States continue unabated, aimed at imposing a *Pax Pretoriana* on the entire southern region of Africa.

350. One of the destructive effects of the policy of constructive engagement has been the fact that it has allowed the racist Pretoria régime to break out of the isolation in which it had found itself as a result of its inhuman policies of *apartheid* and its consistent and impudent defiance of international public opinion. Now that the policy of constructive engagement has conferred respectability on a régime that deserves only banishment, its leaders are welcomed with flower bouquets in the various capitals of the Western world.

351. The question of Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations and calls for determined action by the United Nations. The leadership in Pretoria is beholden to the benighted policy of racism, colonialism and exploitation and, as such, it would be naive to expect it to respond to mere acts of persuasion. It is time for the Security Council to invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and to adopt a decision on comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. My delegation is convinced that unless the international response is principled, firm and unequivocal, the racists in Pretoria will not abandon their determination to continue to enslave the people of Namibia.

352. The people of Namibia in 1984 observe their one-hundredth year of struggle against foreign domination. A century is a long time for a people to be subjugated, exploited and degraded in their own land. Indeed, that is why the people of Namibia, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, had to take up arms to wage a national liberation struggle. Namibians realize from first-hand experience that the enemy is ruthless and, backed as it is by international imperialism, merciless in meting out indiscriminate violence with the more than 100,000 troops it maintains in their territory.

353. That notwithstanding, the people of Namibia are prepared to continue to make the sacrifices required of them to win their freedom, and they know that the progressive and peace-loving forces of the international community are on their side in fraternal solidarity to assist their struggle for national liberation. Still, they would much prefer to see the bloodshed and destruction end and the wounds of bitterness heal as quickly as possible.

354. If victory is not theirs today we have no doubt that it will be theirs tomorrow. It is this fact, the historic inevitability of the victory of the struggle of the Namibian people, that must motivate the international community to muster wisdom, tact and, above all, courage to end forthwith South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, and with it also end the horror and carnage daily being committed by the occupation forces now entrenched in Namibia. In this regard, it is our hope that the United Nations will face up to its responsibilities.

355. As for Africa, its position has been clearly stated in the Declaration on Southern Africa made by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twentieth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, which, *inter alia*, declared as follows:

> "Africa will be satisfied with nothing less than majority rule in an independent and united Namibia and majority rule in a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa. The whole experience of Africa's history, and of world history, confirms that only self-determination for the people of Namibia and South Africa can create for southern Africa an opportunity for peace and stability or remove the threat to international peace and security which now emanates from this area."[14]

356. Mr. **BOUNDOUKOU-LATHA** (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): For close to a century now Namibia has been at the centre of international relations. The international community follows this question with particular attention because it derives from a colonial situation which the United Nations has opposed since its establishment in 1945.

357. For Gabon, whose head of State, Mr. Omar Bongo, President of the Republic, has never spared any effort in championing the right of African peoples to independence and peace, the Namibian problem is a subject of great concern. It is therefore a source of true satisfaction for my delegation that it has been placed on the agenda of the present session.

358. Gabon has at all times supported and will always support the just cause of the Namibian people, who are still under the colonial yoke. Their history needs to be recapitulated here.

359. The struggle of the Namibian people for independence is all the more important for us since it reflects the determination of every people aspiring to freedom. The legitimacy of this struggle derives from the major legal instruments of the United Nations relating to self-determination, and the struggle is a very old one.

360. The fact that the resistance of the Namibian people to colonialism goes back as far as 1884 is evidence of this, as are, in particular, the uprisings in 1907 which were savagely crushed by German imperialism.

361. As everyone knows, that resistance took a decisive turn in 1959 with the establishment of SWAPO, whose creation may be explained by the opposition of South Africa to independence for this country over which, since 1929, it had held the trusteeship Mandate which had been entrusted to the United Kingdom by the League of Nations. The United Nations terminated that Mandate in 1966 in order to lead the Namibian people to State sovereignty.

362. The establishment on 19 May 1967 of the United Nations Council for Namibia also constitutes an important phase in the history of that struggle, especially since that body, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), was given various decision-making and administrative powers and was instructed to represent Namibian interests in international organizations and conferences. Lastly, the recognition of SWAPO by the United Nations and the OAU as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people confirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people for its right to freedom and independence.

363. Unfortunately, however, the tireless efforts undertaken since then by this Organization, in which the international community has joined, have still not brought a solution of the problem. We recall, for instance, that several proposals have been made for the attainment of Namibian independence. Among these was the initiative of the Western contact group—consisting of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America—which proposed a plan providing for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, under the auspices of the United Nations, in application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Similarly, the United Nations Council for Namibia has continued to devote an important part of its activities to seeking ways and means to bring about the early implementation of the negotiated settlement plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). Finally, the Secretary-General, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council under resolution 532 (1983), visited in 1983 all the States of southern Africa to hold consultations with all the parties concerned with a view to bringing about a cease-fire which would lead to the application of resolution 435 (1978).

364. Unfortunately, however, in spite of all these efforts, to its indignation the international community is faced with the fact that Namibia is still under the colonial yoke. Our indignation is all the greater because South Africa, on various pretexts, is deliberately circumventing all the international decisions relating to the independence of Namibia. Instead of complying with the decisions of our Organization, South Africa continues to tighten its grip on Namibia, whose territory it is occupying militarily and whose abundant natural resources it is plundering.

365. In view of all this, Gabon joins other members of the international community in calling for the application of the various resolutions on this question, in particular Security Council resolutions 432 (1978) and 439 (1978), which provide for the independence of Namibia and for elections under the auspices of the United Nations. In this connection, I wish to remind representatives of the statement on this question made by Mr. Martin Bongo, Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Gabonese Republic, from this rostrum on 10 October 1984:

> "As we have done in all our meetings, we have continued to call for strengthening the United Nations role and wish tirelessly to work to achieve respect for the resolutions adopted for the benefit of Namibia. In this connection, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provides for Namibian independence and elections to be held under United Nations auspices, must be strictly implemented. South Africa must prove to the international community its willingness to put an end to its despicable policy of *apartheid* and establish with its neighbours and the rest of the world relations based on mutual respect, non-interference and non-intervention." [*29th meeting, para. 128.*]

366. Our country rejects and condemns any link between the accession of Namibia to international sovereignty and the departure from Angola of the Cuban troops which are there by virtue of bilateral agreements concluded in full sovereignty and in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

367. Although it is true that certain foreign Powers are engaged in all kinds of activities in an effort to control this part of the world, in which geopolitical conditions remain favourable, our country considers that the Namibian problem is, first and foremost, a colonial one. Therefore, it can be resolved only in accordance with the principles of self-determination and independence embodied in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It is therefore for the international community to develop further its actions designed to compel South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia, whose people aspire to freedom, sovereignty and independence.

368. From this standpoint, my delegation can only deplore the scornful attitude of Pretoria towards the action of the United Nations and the OAU with respect to both *apartheid* in South Africa and the independence of the Namibian people. Should we not grasp this opportunity to ask the authorities of Pretoria to consider the lessons of the past? The majority of our countries which were colonized do not have the slightest difficulty in recognizing the need to establish the most diverse relations with our former administering Powers. Once it is independent and sovereign, Namibia too will be able to consider in the best possible conditions the question of its relations with all its neighbours in the region.

369. This reflection leads me to affirm, in conclusion, that the sooner Pretoria respects the relevant resolutions of the United Nations both on Namibia and on South Africa, the better will be the guarantee of peace and security in this part of the world.

370. Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): For almost 38 years now the General Assembly has, thanks to its resolution 65 (I), included the question of Namibia on the agenda of each and every one of its sessions.

371. For how much longer shall we include on our agenda this item, "Question of Namibia"? For how long will arrogant South Africa continue to flout the international community, scorning the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for a settlement of the painful Namibian problem? For how long will the martyred people of Namibia continue to suffer and be denied the exercise of their inalienable rights to self-determination and freedom? When will there be a social and international order capable of ensuring respect for the rights of the Namibian people?

372. The words of the Secretary-General to which I will refer are of paramount importance at a time when, once again, the General Assembly is considering the item on its agenda concerning the tragedy of the people of Namibia:

> "When together we search for ways to achieve the ideals and goals of the Charter, let us not forget the quality of the world we seek to build, the final raison d'être of all our activities: the human being as an individual of whom the Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the right to a social and international order whereby human rights and fundamental freedoms will be fully enjoyed and respected."

It seems that those who deny Namibia its independence have lost from sight the type of world we want to build and the real raison d'être of all our activities, for how else can one explain the constant disdain shown by some when the question of the freedom of the Namibian people is taken up? While waiting for the advent of this social and international order, the Namibian people will continue to suffer—and how much longer?—the injustice, the harassment, the tortures they are subjected to, while their inalienable rights are flouted. Atrocities are being committed against a people whose only crime is to wish to be free.

373. South Africa wants to perpetuate a situation of domination which the international community rejects. SWAPO, the sole genuine representative of the Namibian people, is waging a heroic struggle for the liberation of Namibia and has become the target of South African military action. Under the pretext of pursuing SWAPO, South Africa has carried out vast offensives against Mozambique and Angola, violating the rights of those sovereign States, which only wish to live in peace in order to deal with the development problems facing all developing countries. The Government of Togo understands the reasons which led those two countries to conclude the Lusaka and Nkomati agreements, which, while not in any way jeopardizing the continuation and the final victory of the liberation struggle of SWAPO, also maintain peace in the region. There would have been no need for those agreements had Security Council resolution 435 (1978) been implemented.

374. The adoption of resolution 435 (1978) raised the hopes of the international community, but since that time those hopes have been waning. My delegation still wonders whether all the efforts undertaken, in particular by the Secretary-General, to whom we wish once again to pay tribute, have been made in vain.

375. Resolution 435 (1978) clearly sets out the process which should lead to an independent and sovereign Namibia. But hypocritically, by using delaying tactics and subterfuge, South Africa has always deferred implementation of the aforementioned resolution and has continued to undertake military action against the neighbouring countries, thus defying the Organization. Worse still, there are members of the Security Council which collaborate with South Africa in its delaying tactics, the latest of which is to link the independence of Namibia to the unilateral denunciation of international agreements concluded by sovereign States. As was stated by Mr.

Koffi Amega, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Togolese Republic, in the course of his address in the general debate:

> ". . . the position of the Togolese Government has always been clear. SWAPO enjoys the unswerving support of Togo and the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) cannot be linked to the withdrawal of Cuban troops, whose presence is legally justified by the existence of an agreement entered into by Angola and Cuba as sovereign nations." [*5th meeting, para. 182.*]

376. We welcome the fact that negotiations have been started concerning the appropriate procedure for the withdrawal of those troops within the framework of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In this respect, the message from the President of the People's Republic of Angola addressed a few days ago to the Secretary-General is most edifying.

377. It is quite clear to Togo that the Namibian problem is a problem of decolonization.

378. My delegation understands that in the region there is a question of security for all concerned and that that security must be guaranteed. But that security cannot be assured by force or by military action. It can only be assured through the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), leading to the advent of an independent Namibia, a country which will then be able, in full sovereignty, to conclude agreements with the States in the region, thus guaranteeing peace and security for all in the region.

379. My delegation cannot conclude without commending the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia to accelerate the process towards independence for Namibia and paying a well-deserved tribute to its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, for his personal commitment and dedication to the Namibian cause. While understanding the feelings of frustration that may overcome him at times, my delegation asks him not to lose faith in the future. Whatever happens, the struggle of the Namibian people is part of the irreversible development of the history of all peoples that aspire to live in freedom and independence. The fortitude and the wisdom of the Namibian people are the surest guarantees of the dawn of that freedom and independence.

380. The victory of the Namibian people will be the triumph of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is therefore essential that each Member State ask itself whether the self-determination of the Namibian people must wait indefinitely upon the goodwill of South Africa, and that each State commit itself to shouldering its responsibility to ensure, in accordance with the Charter, the establishment of a free and independent Namibia.

AGENDA ITEM 139

Critical economic situation in Africa (*concluded*)*

381. The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 52nd plenary meeting, held on Tuesday, 6 November. In this connection, the Assembly has before it draft resolution A/39/L.22. I now call on the representative of Cameroon, who wishes to introduce that draft resolution.

382. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): It is an honour and a privilege for my delegation to introduce this important draft resolution and its annexed declaration regarding the critical economic situation in Africa. Since we first introduced the subject to the plenary meeting on behalf of the Group of African States at the commencement of the formal debate on the issue [*47th meeting*], the General Assembly has heard expressions of universal concern for the plight of our young nations at this dangerous and painful juncture of their economic and social history. The African delegations derived a strong sense of solidarity with the rest of mankind from the statements by representatives of Member States, large and small, rich and poor, statements which lend weight to our mutual aspirations for the forging of an international community spirit for solving crucial global and regional problems. Support came from all power blocs and all geographical regions.

383. Guided by that expression of universal concern, the African Group set to work to put on paper its perception of the political framework within which international activities could in future be carried out to alleviate the malaise at present destroying human life and in the long term threatening disasters, even the survival of man. The document produced did not seek to call for humanitarian attitudes on the part of non-African members of the international community. It avoided diatribe and other elements of confrontation that might have been introduced out of disruptive mischief, prompted by past misgivings. It told the story of the African experience underlying the overworked clichées employed by others to show that we ought fundamentally, as Africans, to be masters of our own economic and social destiny. The document pointed out that in spite of golden opportunities exploited, the truth remained that the economic performance of many African countries was characterized by declining per capita incomes, stagnant or negative rates of growth and declining per capita food production.

384. The document also points out that "According to all projections, prospects for recovery, growth and development remain very dim unless the efforts currently under way in African countries are fully supported by the international community." [*See A/39/L.22, annex, para. 4.*] This perspective of the situation was generally shared by all who spoke to us during consultations thereon. We consequently proceeded to consult all groups, both regional bodies and those with substantive interests, on aspects of our draft proposals that addressed practical steps for common agreement towards arresting the course of events. Africans consented to abandon certain cherished ideas, some of which had been meticulously moulded by testing and experience at home, in order to make sure that a consensus statement of the determination of Member States would be reflected in the draft declaration to be adopted. We wish to express appreciation for the frankness of our colleagues in the various regional and interest groups who made concrete written proposals.

385. The negotiations were prolonged partly because they were difficult and partly because of the prevailing desire to produce general agreement and consequently consensus. We do not wish to go into the details of the negotiating efforts between our group and each of the others. Suffice it to say that what is now before the Assembly today is far removed from Africa's original ideas at this session,

---

*Resumed from the 52nd meeting.

and even farther removed from those presented by us during the exchanges at the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council at Geneva.

386. It is our view that the text now formally presented for adoption belongs to all the groups, because it now reflects modifications intended to meet concerns expressed by interests as varied as those presented by Western European bodies, notably the European Economic Community and the Nordic countries and their supporters, and by the socialist group, which also showed sufficient understanding, and by very many others.

387. Compromise that leads to consensus is constructive. It does not pretend to cover all the concerns of everyone; it only represents a basic statement with which all sides can live. On an issue as important as this, having regard to the diversity of claims to leadership and the irreconcilable economic and social systems across the globe, the attainment of this text demonstrates the scope of the existing political will over the issue of the African economic crisis. The emergency measures being taken, as well as those contemplated, further demonstrate the attending constructive attitude.

388. The broad question now is: Where do we go from here? A declaration is not enough; it merely states a political basis for future action. The elaboration of this declaration has demonstrated once again that in addressing the problems faced by the African continent we cannot afford to insist that solutions be based only on the perspectives of the experience of our friends in the developed world—experience gained in different worlds, from history written at different periods of scientific and technological development.

389. Let historians say of us that this was a generation inspired for the common good. President Paul Biya of my nation, Cameroon, recently asked his own countrymen what future they wanted for their children. We too must ask what we desire to hand to future generations. The present situation in Africa and in some other parts of the world calls for United-Nations-Charter-style co-operation. We must look at the dangerous provocations to international peace and security, not in temporary and unproductive humanitarian terms. We must all, in our generation, endeavour to see that we grow in an international community that is not infested by hunger, disease and underdevelopment fostered by a type of economic *apartheid*. It is conducive to lasting peace that the fruits of global development be seen and felt in the poor areas across the globe. Deprived peoples grow in an atmosphere of hate and revolt. They must be removed from that plight if pockets of potential explosions are not to endanger world peace.

390. We consequently call for massive mobilization of efforts, not only to adopt this declaration by consensus, but also to make clear to history our full engagement with its objectives.

391. We wish to express special appreciation to the co-ordinator, Tomohiko Kobayashi of Japan, for his excellent assistance in the process of negotiations. He ensured that the parties got together whenever they wanted to, and he remained an optimist whose political instincts sustained his indefatigability. The co-ordinator has made certain suggestions which could further the cause of wider acceptance and strengthen consensus on this text. We should be happy to subscribe to these suggestions if, indeed, that would remove all reservations.

392. We commend the draft resolution with the annexed declaration to the General Assembly for adoption now by consensus and by acclamation.

393. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the co-ordinator of the informal consultations on this item, Tomohiko Kobayashi of Japan.

394. Mr. KOBAYASHI (Japan): It is my honour and pleasure, as co-ordinator on this subject, to inform the General Assembly of the amendments to which, as indicated by Mr. Engo, the parties concerned have agreed as a result of extensive consultations among themselves. The amendments are in paragraph 17 of the draft declaration and are as follows: First, following the phrase "extended multi-year rescheduling are among the measures", the words "which deserve urgent action" have been replaced by "to be dealt with urgently". Secondly, in the sentence beginning "Furthermore, it is essential to ensure", the word "Furthermore" has been deleted. All those amendments were agreed upon with the understanding that all Member States would give their full support to the declaration, without reservation.

395. Allow me to take this opportunity to express my highest appreciation and deepest gratitude to all those involved in these negotiations for their spirit of co-operation and determination and for their very constructive attitude aimed at finding common elements to resolve the critical situation in Africa. Finally, I wholeheartedly thank the President of the Assembly and the Secretary-General for their guidance in the achievement of this constructive consensus.

396. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/39/L.22. May I take it that the Assembly adopts the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/39/L.22 was adopted (resolution 39/29).

397. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General.

398. The SECRETARY-GENERAL (*interpretation from French*): Circumstances beyond my control made it impossible for me to speak at the beginning of the debate on the critical economic situation in Africa. I therefore take great pleasure in addressing the Assembly today, when it has adopted the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa that constitutes the felicitous conclusion of its deliberations on this item.

399. This Declaration is a sign of hope for Africa. It attests to the will of the international community, in particular the African countries, to act effectively together in order to solve African problems. It clearly indicates the need not only to meet emergency situations but also to take action in regard to the deep reasons for those situations.

400. Indeed, we all know that climatic conditions, however unfavourable they may be, do not suffice in themselves to explain the scope and intensity of the African crisis. We all know that it is not a mere coincidence that the most severely affected countries are those that have been classified as least developed. Because of the vulnerability of African economies and their structural weaknesses, immediate action must be taken, as the Declaration recommends.

401. As we are meeting here, millions of Africans, threatened by malnutrition and famine, are struggling to survive. A large number of those who escape death, in particular young children, will suffer irreversible physical and intellectual harm that will affect them for the rest of their days, and they will be unable to live the life they had the right to expect.

402. This is a situation which is morally unbearable for the international community and we are all duty-bound to do our utmost to help our brothers in Africa. In this connection I am gratified to note that the agencies of the United Nations system involved in the African crisis have taken diligent and effective action, in keeping with their means, from its very beginning.

403. The time is no longer for talk, but action. This is precisely why in my note dated 1 November regarding the critical economic situation in Africa [*A/39/627*], I made concrete proposals for action. I was pleased to note that these proposals were generally well received. I intend to follow them up.

404. As a concrete measure towards the implementation of the Declaration which the General Assembly has just adopted, I have decided to convene a meeting on Africa on 17 December next. The purpose of that meeting will be to draw attention to the particularly worrisome situation in some African countries and to the most urgent action the international community must effectively undertake together in order to combat the famine, as well as to make possible renewed growth and development. We shall invite to that meeting representatives of all States Members of the United Nations, as well as representatives of United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations.

405. I think that we entirely realize the complexity and gravity of the crisis Africa is experiencing. If we do not act quickly together, the situation may deteriorate further. The Declaration lays down the guidelines for our action. I therefore urgently appeal to all Member States to implement it as speedily as possible. For its part, the United Nations has already begun this work.

406. The PRESIDENT: The adoption of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa is a historic event. This is the first time in the history of the United Nations that the General Assembly has endorsed a document prescribing concerted international action for the economic well-being of the African continent. I am particularly gratified that it has been adopted by consensus. This explains the long negotiating process which started in the Economic and Social Council in Geneva last July and continued here in New York over the past two months. We have indeed, in the words of the Charter of the United Nations, harmonized the views and actions of States, and we have employed international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of peoples—in this special case the advancement of the African peoples.

407. I would like to thank all delegations representing the various regional groups, which participated in the negotiations culminating in the agreement which we have just approved. I wish, in particular, to thank the co-ordinator of the negotiations, Mr. Kobayashi, for his perseverance and determination to see this document to its successful conclusion.

408. I wish also to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for the initiative he took earlier this year to draw attention to the seriousness of the situation in Africa, a concern he demonstrated by his two visits to the continent this year. In addition, I wish to thank him for the practical action which he has undertaken so far to alleviate the situation. His efforts paved the way for our consideration of the issue in plenary meetings of the Assembly and for the adoption of this Declaration, which, in my view, is perhaps the most articulate expression of political will the Assembly has made in the course of its current session.

409. The African continent is now facing a crisis of unprecedented dimensions, whose intensity is becoming more visible every day in terms of human suffering and as a serious threat to human survival in certain countries. We must translate this Declaration into action in order to deal more effectively with the emergency situation.

410. Let me point out, however, that the African crisis is not a sudden crisis. It is deep-rooted. This is why the Declaration should also be translated into action for dealing with the long-term aspects of the situation, namely, the chronic problems which have characterized the economic and social life of the African continent. The constant deterioration of economic and social conditions in several African countries bodes ill for the future. They paint a picture of misery and hopelessness. The document which has just been approved represents a golden opportunity for us to take urgent action to prevent a further deterioration of the situation and thus create conditions favourable not just for growth but, more so, for economic and social self-sufficiency.

411. As the African States have emphasized, especially since the adoption in 1980 of the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, the primary responsibility for the development of Africa rests with the Africans themselves. However, the task to be accomplished is so immense that they need the support of the international community. The Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa represents a new and concrete reaffirmation of such support. I hope the international community will not disappoint the millions of people in Africa, most of them children, whose lives could be spared by the full implementation of this vital document.

412. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions on draft resolution A/39/L.22.

413. Mr. KURODA (Japan): My delegation wholeheartedly and most warmly welcomes the adoption of the Declaration by consensus, which is a result of the combined efforts of both developed and developing countries to respond effectively to the critical economic situation in Africa. The adoption of the Declaration by consensus clearly reflects the recognition by Governments and their representatives here in New York of the urgent need for concerted action *vis-à-vis* the extremely grave situation.

414. In his statement in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of Japan appealed [*9th meeting*] for an active response to the problems of hunger and economic difficulties afflicting Africa. Moreover, he recently made a trip to Africa and personally observed the dire situation there. As a result of his first-hand observation, the Foreign Minister became determined to see that much more is done to meet the needs of the people of Africa. Upon his return to

Japan, he issued an appeal to the international community. This appeal has been distributed as document A/39/724, the main part of which I shall quote as follows:

> "While on this tour, I became acutely aware of the need to strengthen not only food assistance to those afflicted African countries, but also co-operation with them in such areas as storage and transportation of food, water supply and agricultural development. From this point of view, I announced in the course of the tour that my Government intended to extend to Africa in financial year 1984 supplemental food and agricultural assistance amounting to approximately $50 million, in addition to the food-related assistance of more than $115 million which my Government had approved by the end of October this year. Such assistance is, however, far too insufficient to meet the needs of the African people suffering from starvation and malnutrition, estimated at about 150 million.
>
> "I feel keenly that the calamity of drought is a menace to world peace and stability no less than armed conflict. I now wish to appeal to the international community at large to recognize the necessity and importance not only of emergency assistance to African countries, but also of positively carrying out agricultural and food-related assistance for them based on medium- and long-term points of view and supporting their self-reliant efforts. I also wish to stress the importance, greater than ever, of the exchange of information and ideas among donor countries and between donor and recipient countries for the effective implementation of such assistance activities." [*A/39/724, annex, paras. 2 and 3.*]

415. The Declaration just adopted provides the international community with a basis for strengthening and consolidating efforts to help African countries overcome the present emergency and to establish medium-term and long-term development programmes. Vigorous action should be taken at all levels, national, regional and international. In this regard, all United Nations agencies have a special role to play. I take this opportunity to express to the Secretary-General my delegation's appreciation of his active efforts to promote an effective international response to the very grave situation in Africa. My delegation also expresses deep appreciation to the Secretariat members concerned for the efficient work they have carried out so far. I should like to urge, however, that in implementing the Declaration the United Nations system strive to provide assistance to Africa in an even more efficient and co-ordinated manner. It can best do so by more fully utilizing the existing consultative mechanism and by setting up task forces to supplement the co-ordination work now under way.

416. In concluding, I should like to express my earnest hope that the Declaration will contribute to reducing the suffering of the peoples of Africa. Japan stands firmly committed to do its part in joint international efforts.

417. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): It is with great pleasure that the European Community and its member States welcome the adoption of this resolution containing the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa. It is a clear reflection of the deep concern of the international community at the grave crisis confronting Africa. The long historical ties between Europe and Africa make us all the more acutely aware of the alarming proportions the situation has now reached, threatening the lives of millions of people. When the Secretary-General warned of the danger of a downward spiral of economic decline, poverty and hunger, he was not speaking of a vague or ill-defined threat which might become real at some future date. In recent weeks we have seen tragic evidence that disaster has already befallen many African countries.

418. The crisis in Africa arises from many factors, and it is essential to come to grips with the underlying causes as well as to take prompt and effective action to deal with immediate emergencies. The efforts which are already being undertaken to help deal with the crisis have to be strengthened. The African countries recognize that they have primary responsibility for addressing the crisis. Nevertheless, it is clear that, despite the courageous and often heroic efforts of the African peoples, the dimensions of the crisis are beyond their ability to cope with on their own. The support of the international community is indispensable if further tragedy is to be averted and the African countries are to be able once again to resume the path of development. The Declaration we have just adopted expresses the determination of the international community to enhance its efforts to meet the needs of the African countries.

419. Africa is a continent of enormous potential endowed with great human and material resources. The African Governments and peoples have achieved considerable progress in meeting the challenge posed by the daunting problems of development they have had to face. Nevertheless, great though the achievement is, it has not been able to match the even greater and more immense need. These Governments have said that Africa has to strengthen its development capacity so that its peoples can enjoy a respectable standard of living and so that political and social stability can prevail. The African countries have set themselves this goal as well as that of establishing in the not-too-distant future truly dynamic, self-reliant and interdependent economies capable of functioning as effective partners in the international economic system.

420. The European Community and its member States wish to encourage our African friends in this endeavour, and we will do our utmost to help them realize this objective. Through the Lomé Convention we have entered into a contract of solidarity with the vast majority of these countries in which our major aim is to support their efforts to achieve self-reliant and self-sustained development.

421. We believe that the present Declaration will be of real value in providing a political impetus towards realizing the evident commitment of the international community to work together with the African countries in a common endeavour to find practical, realistic and effective solutions which will help them surmount this crisis and create a solid foundation for their future development and well-being.

422. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The adoption of the resolution containing the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa by consensus indicates the international community's awareness of the serious economic situation in Africa and international support for Africa. This

Declaration has political significance and shows the African countries that they are not alone at this time of distress resulting from the current economic situation.

423. We welcome the adoption of the Declaration by consensus, and at the same time would like to see in this consensus a true desire to reach agreements on the part of all groups, particularly the African Group, which has made many efforts in that direction because of its awareness of the vital nature of the subject.

424. I need not go into the details of the agreed formula. What is important at this stage is that an agreement has been reached and endorsed by the General Assembly by consensus. We all understand the meaning of words, and we hope that the Declaration will produce tangible results and make a positive contribution in assisting the African States in this tragedy, as mentioned by the Secretary-General a few moments ago.

425. Egypt, in its capacity as Chairman of the Group of 77, would like to express on behalf of that Group the hope that progress will be achieved in other spheres on the basis of good intentions and political will, in the spirit of a desire for dialogue and avoidance of confrontation. It was this attitude that characterized the atmosphere preceding the adoption of the Declaration. Such a spirit enhances our belief in the importance of international solidarity and co-operation, which are basic in dealing with the problems of the world and provide the only means of finding solutions.

426. Mr. RESHETNYAK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connection with the adoption of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, I have been asked to make a statement on behalf of the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

427. The socialist countries on whose behalf I speak share the international community's profound concern about the critical economic situation in Africa. They welcome the initiatives within the framework of the United Nations, and action by individual countries, by international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and by all those who have been working selflessly to help Africa overcome this critical situation.

428. The current economic and social crisis in Africa has its roots in the continent's colonial past and results from the neo-colonialist policies of the imperialist Powers, which are attempting to shift onto the shoulders of the peoples of the countries of Africa and other developing countries the burden of the economic crisis in the capitalist sector of the world economy. The unprecedented drought and other natural disasters have only further revealed the weakness of the African economy and its vulnerability to the "free play" of market forces.

429. The imperialist States bear full responsibility for the consequences of the past colonial exploitation of the human and natural resources of the African continent and of the continuing present neo-colonialist plunder of that continent. Therefore it is only too reasonable to demand that those responsible for the difficulties now being experienced by Africa should compensate for the damage done to its economic and social development.

430. Certain Western circles would like to replace a radical restructuring of international economic relations with partial measures enabling them to retain the powerful levers of control over the economies of the developing countries, including those of Africa. On the pretext of "enhancing the effectiveness" of external assistance, and on other pretexts too, attempts are being made to interfere in the economic policies of African and other developing countries in order to force them to relinquish the goals of their national development plans, imposing on them, against the will of their peoples, an alien order and creating conditions propitious for the injection into their economies of private foreign capital—first and foremost that of transnational corporations. This would crudely trample underfoot the sovereign right of the African States to determine their own future themselves.

431. The socialist countries condemn the actions of those who, behind a mask of humanitarianism, are in fact capitalizing on Africa's difficulties and attempting to subordinate the countries of Africa, against the will of their peoples, to the "magic of the capitalist market-place" and to subordinate their future and their social and economic development to the caprices of private foreign capital. To that end, increasing use is being made of various "assistance" programmes, which are declared to be regional but which are actually earmarked only for countries prepared to agree to pursue a "policy of encouraging private initiative" and "private international investment". Such programmes, in essence, are one way of exerting pressure on African and other developing countries to compel them to turn away from the State sector and from their plans for independent national development—in other words, from their plans to bring about economic decolonization.

432. The course pursued by imperialist forces to turn Africa into an arena of global political confrontation includes the attempt to declare Africa, or parts of it, to be a "sphere of vital interests". That course runs counter to the interests of the independent development of African States.

433. The socialist countries on whose behalf I speak believe that only in circumstances of lasting peace will it be possible to solve the complex problems facing mankind. Arms reduction and disarmament would make it possible to release enormous sums for development purposes, for the struggle against hunger and malnutrition and for solving other social and economic problems of developing countries.

434. The socialist countries members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance [*CMEA*] are staunch supporters of the adoption of effective decisions and measures to eliminate all forms of exploitation in international economic relations, of discrimination, artificial obstacles and inequitable terms of trade. They also support the establishment of a just, economically well-founded system of pricing for raw materials, food and industrial products. To this end, we favour increased control over the activities of transnational corporations. We are in favour of the democratization of currency and financial relations and against the policy of uncontrolled high interest rates. We are in favour of normalizing

conditions for granting and liquidating international credit, so that the present conditions—particularly in the light of the indebtedness of developing countries—should not be used to exert political pressure and to intervene in the internal affairs of States.

435. The socialist countries have consistently supported the efforts of African and other developing countries to do away with their unequal position in the world capitalist economic system. The communiqué of the thirty-ninth session of CMEA, held at Havana from 29 to 31 October 1984, stressed the view of the heads of Government of States members of CMEA that

> "The States members of CMEA firmly support the young independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America in their struggle against imperialism, hegemonism, neo-colonialism, racism in all its forms and manifestations, and *apartheid*, and are in favour of strengthening their economic and political independence."

436. The States members of CMEA have been providing considerable assistance to African States to build and strengthen the bases of their own national economies. With our help more than 1,700 industrial facilities have been built in African countries. These include 450 in the energy field, more than 200 in the food industry, 150 in agriculture, about 40 in the field of ferrous and non-ferrous metals and more than 300 in the area of health, housing and education.

437. With the help of specialists from CMEA member countries, there is prospecting in many African States for mineral deposits. Hydrotechnology installations have been established, along with irrigation systems, and high-yield crops have been introduced into agriculture. Among these States are Congo, Ghana, Guinea, Mozambique, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Mali, Angola, Tanzania, Ivory Coast, Zambia, Madagascar, Togo, Somalia, Algeria, Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco and other interested countries.

438. Analysis of the reasons for the hunger and malnutrition shows that food problems involve a complicated bundle of social and economic factors. Accordingly, these should be tackled comprehensively; they should not be resolved merely through technical or other organizational measures. The search for a genuine solution involves a concentration of efforts and resources on the part of the African countries themselves to take steps to strengthen the State's sovereignty over its natural resources, to initiate national food programmes, to enhance the role of the State sector and to introduce planned economic methods, in addition to the implementation of other progressive social and economic reforms, including democratic agrarian reform in accordance with national development plans.

439. The delegations of the socialist countries did not object to the adoption of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa. We understand the desire of African countries for the Declaration to be adopted by consensus, in the hope of somehow finding a chance to ease their difficult economic situation. At the same time, however, we wish to point out that this Declaration is essentially technical in nature. It lacks any indication of the great number of true reasons for the critical situation in Africa or of specific ways of overcoming that situation in the interests of the long-term development of African countries.

440. The proper solution to the acute social and economic problems of the African continent is indissolubly linked with the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and equal footing and the strengthening, on the basis of a broad, anti-imperialist, anti-racist and anti-colonialist platform, of the unity and solidarity of the peoples of Africa with the developing countries of other continents.

441. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): My delegation very much welcomes the consensus adoption of this Declaration. We joined in the consensus as a sign of our solidarity with African peoples that are struggling today for their very survival and to lay the foundations for their better future. We consider the Declaration to be one more affirmation of the increasing world focus on the nearly overwhelming dimensions of Africa's immediate crisis. I would like to commend the efforts of the Group of African States to reach a consensus on this item. During the negotiations both at the summer session of the Economic and Social Council and here in the General Assembly they have shown a courageous determination to achieve co-operation among all delegations. For this they deserve our praise and appreciation.

442. This Declaration on Africa's critical economic situation reflects the tremendous efforts to mobilize the world community that have recently resulted in a surge of emergency food shipments to that ravaged region in an outpouring of compassion unequalled in recent years. But the Declaration goes beyond expressing the concern of the world at the current plight of Africa's peoples. It points the way towards the future and towards the efforts needed to ensure that Africa need never again witness the human agony now being experienced there.

443. We applaud the recognition in the Declaration that African countries bear the primary responsibility not only for addressing the present crisis but also for undertaking the painful adjustment measures needed to correct past failures and set-backs. Clearly, the international community is determined to continue its support of the reforms needed to improve the situation.

444. This Declaration makes a positive contribution by recognizing the urgent need to attain national and collective self-reliance in food production and, more important, by listing the sort of policy decisions necessary for this vital transformation. In the opinion of my delegation, first and foremost is the need to allow market mechanisms to create the appropriate incentives for increased food production. This idea is also reflected in the Declaration.

445. The efforts of national Governments will not be enough, however, if Africa is to overcome its structural imbalances. Urgent action is needed on many fronts to help ease external pressures on the sub-Saharan countries. This is implicitly recognized in the paragraphs on debt and trade. Nothing in the Declaration prejudges the outcome of the case-by-case consultations between creditor and debtor nations in the Paris Club and elsewhere. My delegation was therefore pleased to see the recognition these sections show for the case-by-case approach adopted by donor countries to help evaluate economic-adjustment policies of debtor countries and propose possible debt-relief measures.

446. We are also pleased to see that the Declaration embraces the World Bank's special programme for sub-Saharan Africa. My country stands fully pre-

pared to support these efforts to increase attention to this region. In this regard, we are not convinced of the need to create a new multilateral facility for African countries, but we encourage other countries to consider creating their own special facilities at the national level similar to our own, known as the Economic Policy Initiative for Africa. We further appreciate the fact that the Declaration encourages developing countries to make the improvements needed to meet the conditions for full use of the compensatory financing facility.

447. In closing, my delegation wishes to stress that although we all know that a declaration of this sort represents no binding commitment to specific actions at the technical level, it has vital importance as an indication of the firm commitment by the world community to deal effectively with Africa's problems. My country has demonstrated its commitment to doing everything possible to support effective efforts by African countries themselves. We have already been reacting swiftly to meet their needs. We will continue to do so. But if this Declaration helps to mobilize international public opinion and political will it will have made a critical contribution to achieving a better destiny for Africa.

448. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): On behalf of the Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway—I would like to express our deep satisfaction that the General Assembly has been able to adopt by consensus a resolution and an action-oriented Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa. The Declaration gives the political signal from the General Assembly to the world community which we called for in our statement in the general debate on this issue [*47th meeting*]. The negotiations on the Declaration have been long, and it has been a difficult process. We commend the flexibility and spirit of compromise shown by all concerned.

449. The Nordic countries are prepared to do their share in the international efforts to help the affected countries in Africa to overcome their critical economic situation. As we stated in the general debate, it is now time for action.

450. Today I reiterate the commitment of the Nordic countries to increase their development assistance to sub-Saharan Africa. We will provide emergency assistance to alleviate the suffering in drought-stricken African countries bilaterally as well as through multilateral institutions. We will also provide assistance for the longer-term development efforts of Africa. We will continue and increase our bilateral aid to countries in Africa, and we will continue our strong support of the important international development agencies, such as UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, the African Development Bank and the World Bank. We also intend to support the special programme recently presented by the World Bank. We have decided on or are considering special contributions to the World Bank for the benefit of Africa.

451. Furthermore, our delegations are prepared to join in discussions on measures in fields other than official development assistance.

452. We appreciate the initiatives taken by the Secretary-General to alleviate the critical situation in Africa. We are prepared to co-operate fully with him in his endeavour to co-ordinate international efforts for the benefit of Africa.

453. Mr. LEE (Canada): Over a month ago [*51st meeting*], during the debate on the critical economic situation in Africa, our representative, Mr. Lewis, expressed the Canadian Government's belief that a consensus declaration coming from this body could go a long way to foster that atmosphere of political will and international co-operation which could galvanize the efforts to mobilize human, financial and other resources, both nationally and internationally, to address the crisis in Africa. We are delighted that through good will on the part of all concerned such a declaration has now been adopted.

454. As the representative of Cameroon has just mentioned, during the course of our successful negotiations on this Declaration all of us accepted wording not precisely as we might have chosen ourselves. Realizing the importance of a strong consensus declaration, we have collectively taken the position that the value of a common statement on this critical situation far outweighs questions of detail. We pay a tribute to this flexibility and the positive spirit of co-operation that animated those most concerned, including notably the African countries themselves, in the desire for a consensus.

455. May I in this regard join in saluting our colleague Mr. Kobayashi of Japan, who served as co-ordinator, for his indefatigable efforts.

456. Africa will remain a priority for Canadian development co-operation, as it has been in the past. Our commitment will not diminish, but rather will be intensified, to address both the short-term humanitarian priorities and the longer-term development needs of the region. Declarations neither feed the hungry nor alleviate human suffering; they can only act as a catalyst for collective action. It is to that action that we must now turn.

457. Mr. MALIK (India): I would like to begin on this solemn occasion by reading out the statement on the critical economic situation in Africa made some days ago by the Prime Minister of India and Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries:

> "Africa today faces a grave situation caused by a long spell of drought and famine. Our hearts go out in sympathy to the people of the affected countries. They have been facing hunger, disease and death. Children and old people have borne the brunt of the tragedy. We are deeply concerned at this colossal human suffering unprecedented in Africa. Appeals for emergency assistance have gone out from the Organization of African Unity, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as other international organizations and Governments. The Government and people of India express their solidarity with the Governments and peoples of African countries affected by this tragedy. As Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, we are in touch with other non-aligned countries on the question of short- and long-term assistance which can be given to the African countries in overcoming the present crisis. At the same time, India is ready to share her own experience and resources to the extent possible in helping our African brethren in meeting this stark challenge. We are willing to send grain, medicines, teams of doctors as well as other experts that may be needed by the most seriously affected countries of Africa. Our diplomatic missions in Africa have been asked to get in touch with the Governments of the countries concerned and to ascertain their specific

requirements for medical and other technical personnel to help overcome the present critical conditions."

458. We are indeed deeply gratified at the adoption by consensus of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa by the General Assembly. It involves a clear recognition by the international community of its commitment to finding urgent and practical solutions to assist the African States in their efforts to overcome the emergency situation facing them.

459. Of equal importance to that of meeting the emergency needs of the countries concerned is the need to assist on a simultaneous, integrated and continuous basis in meeting the medium- and long-term requirements of Africa. The areas of priority attention have been reflected in the Declaration, particularly in paragraphs 11 through 14. It is obvious that to give positive action-oriented content to the programmes of rehabilitation, reconstruction and further growth-related development there has to be emphasis on the part of the international community on an assured basis for resource flows to the seriously affected States of Africa. This is appropriately stressed in paragraph 16 of the Declaration, wherein it is stated that "Without an increase in net capital inflows and urgent debt relief measures, prospects for recovery and development in Africa will be undermined."

460. It is indeed gratifying that the international community has shown such solidarity in co-operating with Africa in its time of greatest need. Unless urgent action is taken, however, the rapidly deteriorating situation in Africa may well lead to disaster. We hope and trust that the response of the international community will be adequate to meet this challenge.

461. Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): We have sent an important message to the world public that we consider the special problems of the African continent as a challenge we are resolved to take up jointly. The speaker on behalf of the European Community, the representative of Ireland, a short while ago expressed the satisfaction of the member States of the European Community with the result achieved. I, of course, fully associate myself with his statement. Like our partners in the Community we are prepared, within the scope of a dialogue based on partnership, to contribute to overcoming the critical economic situation in Africa by continuing and strengthening our extensive bilateral and multilateral development co-operation and by more effective co-ordination of our common efforts.

462. In this context I should like to refer to my statement in the General Assembly on 6 November [*51st meeting*]. It was in that spirit that my delegation participated in the negotiations on the resolution on the critical economic situation in Africa just adopted. My delegation has endeavoured for many years to devote particular attention to the specific problems of the African countries. Africa is one of the priority areas of my country's economic co-operation. By choosing a very flexible approach along the guidelines of the Economic Summit Meeting held in London in June 1984, my Government has taken account of the worsening debt situation. We feel committed to this policy in the future also. By consenting to an increasing number of rescheduling arrangements, my Government has contributed to preventing the growing debt burden from cutting short the world development process. Indeed, by addressing the particular situation of the country concerned within the framework of close consultations, it will be possible to find the optimal solution to the individual case.

463. I am confident that in this way we shall be able, together with our African friends, to contribute towards overcoming the critical economic situation in Africa.

464. Mr. XIE (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all I wish to thank Mr. Engo, Chairman of the Group of African States, and Mr. Kobayashi for the introductory statements they have made.

465. My delegation has carefully studied document A/39/L.22, which contains certain emergency measures proposed by the African countries to alleviate the present critical economic situation in Africa. It also contains some very important measures for the short- and medium-term development of Africa. We have participated in the consultations on the draft and have given it full support from the very beginning. In our view, document A/39/L.22 is a carefully considered document. It was prepared not only with a view to solving the serious difficulties faced by Africa, but it has also taken into account the views of the parties concerned.

466. In view of the emergency needs of Africa for its survival and development, it was both timely and necessary for the General Assembly to adopt such a document. Its adoption serves as an expression of the sympathy and support of the Member States towards the African countries and peoples, an expression of their solidarity on such an urgent question. It also serves as an expression of the joint political will of the United Nations on the important question of the critical economic situation in Africa.

467. The result of today's meeting is most encouraging. We hope that the adoption of the Declaration will lead to more and more meaningful concrete action.

468. Lastly, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Engo and to Mr. Kobayashi for their efforts in getting the Declaration adopted.

The meeting rose at 9.50 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[2] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16106.

[3] See *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 46.

[4] See A/40/87, annex, resolution AHG/Res.125 (XX).

[5] *International Status of South-West Africa, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 143.

[6] A/AC.115/L.611.

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1980*, document S/14179.

[8] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding*

Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971, p. 16.

[9] *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15943.

[10] Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.

[11] União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

[12] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16237.

[13] See A/AC.131/PV.428.

[14] A/40/87, annex, declaration AHG/Decl.1 (XX), para. 19.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

84th PLENARY MEETING
Tuesday, 4 December 1984, at 10.50 a.m.
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): At the 18th meeting of the thirty-sixth session, when dealing with the question of Namibia within the context of the general debate, my delegation found it unthinkable that South Africa could continue indefinitely to obstruct United Nations efforts on behalf of Namibia's independence. We expressed this view because no political issue before the world Organization has earned a clearer international consensus or been governed by more specific directives of the Security Council than the question of Namibia. Unfortunately, what seemed unthinkable three years ago is a sad reality today, when South Africa still occupies Namibia illegally, in defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and of the International Court of Justice, and when its manoeuvres continue to subvert the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence.

2. The world community has watched with a mixture of scepticism and hope the series of negotiations taking place outside the Security Council. But every time some sign of progress appears, South Africa reshuffles the cards, deals a new hand and raises the stakes. For the people of Namibia and neighbouring States there is no entertainment in this process: there is only the grim reality of South Africa's racist, colonialist and hegemonist policies.

3. It seems clear to my delegation that unless appropriate pressure is placed on South Africa we can expect that it will continue its attempts to bypass the United Nations and maintain control of Namibia through the creation of puppet institutions. We shall continue to see the harsh political repression and military intimidation of the people of Namibia by the pervasive occupation force of over 100,000 troops; these forces and their sophisticated armaments will continue to be directed against the legitimate liberation struggle inside and outside Namibia, led by the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], the sole representative of the Namibian people, and also against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring States. Furthermore, in this year, which marks a century of colonial oppression, the Namibian people will be offered little or no prospect of deliverance from the inhuman policies of *apartheid*.

4. In recent years, when international attention has been focused on events outside Namibia, it has perhaps been overlooked that all the indignities and violations of human rights which accompany *apartheid* in South Africa are also suffered by the Namibian people. The migrant labour system, the designation of tribal homelands and the restriction of educational, health and other basic facilities all serve to perpetuate widespread deprivation and poverty and to strip the majority of the people of their human dignity.

5. As we are all aware, there are other grave consequences for Namibia and its people that attend South Africa's continued illegal presence. The undermining of national unity through the promotion of tribal divisions and the threat to Namibia's territorial integrity posed by attempts to consolidate the illegal annexation of Walvis Bay and the offshore islands have been condemned, without result, by the international community. The long list of crimes which continue to be perpetrated against the Namibian people must of course include South Africa's ruthless exploitation and plunder of Namibia's natural resources, in collusion with foreign corporations and in callous disregard for the present needs and future interests of the Namibian people.

6. In this regard, my delegation greatly appreciates the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to keep this matter before the attention of the world and to publicize the extent of non-compliance with its Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[1]

7. My Government is deeply concerned about the present stalemate over Namibia. It is indeed unconscionable that the Namibian people, for which the United Nations has a special responsibility, should remain one of the last to be liberated from colonial rule and should languish under intolerable racist oppression. We are also deeply concerned over the degree of success attained by South Africa with its policies of diplomatic stalling and military intimidation in Namibia and in the southern African region as a whole.

8. In this situation, all Member States have a solemn obligation to support the principles and measures adopted to ensure Namibia's march to independence and freedom. Somalia joins the vast majority in reaffirming that Security Council resolu-

tion 435 (1978) is the only acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

9. We highly commend the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts to promote the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and we welcome his confirmation that all outstanding issues relevant to resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved. We trust that renewed efforts for its speedy implementation will be made in the light of Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which makes it clear that Namibia's independence must not be obstructed by linkage with extraneous issues.

10. The Government of Angola has put forward constructive proposals, in the free exercise of its sovereignty, in order to promote both Namibia's independence and guarantees of Angola's security and territorial integrity. The world community cannot fail to note that the sincere efforts of Angola to bring about a peaceful settlement, and the moderation and statesmanship of SWAPO, are in stark contrast to South Africa's attempt to control the Namibian situation through trickery, subversion, military occupation and military aggression. In paying a tribute to SWAPO, my Government wishes to affirm its support for the legitimate armed struggle against illegal occupation and racist oppression.

11. The world community has repeatedly seen talks and negotiations on Namibia's independence break down on the rock of South Africa's intransigence and bad faith. For how long will this farcical process be allowed to continue? The United Nations must resolutely face such questions as the legal implications for States of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, the threat to regional and international peace and security posed by South Africa's illegal, inhuman and aggressive policies, and the grave challenge to the authority of the world Organization posed by South Africa's contempt for the decisions of the Security Council.

12. In our view, there has never been a greater need for the diplomatic, economic, social and financial isolation of South Africa, for the exertion of efforts by Governments to prevent collusion by their nationals in the plunder of Namibia's resources, for the extension and strict observance of the arms embargo against South Africa, and for an end to all nuclear collaboration with the *apartheid* régime.

13. The Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization clearly spelt out the expectations of the Namibian people when he asked for meaningful action rather than words. My delegation strongly supports his call for the adoption of enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to force the Pretoria régime to relinquish its illegal hold over Namibia. In responding to this call, the Security Council would make good a promise it has repeatedly made and repeatedly failed to keep. Undoubtedly, South Africa's intransigence is due in large part to the comforting experience of past years, when punitive measures available under the Charter have not been used against it even though such measures have been clearly justified.

14. We join the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization in the hope that his inspiring words will rekindle outrage and invigorate the world community to take concrete measures to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

15. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): The question of Namibia seems to have four principal elements, namely: the abolition of colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* in Namibia; the need to allow Namibians to exercise self-determination and to enjoy sovereign rights in a free, unitary and independent Namibia; the existence of the linkage between Namibia's independence and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola; and the relations between Angola and South Africa in particular and between South Africa and other States in the region in general.

16. In a continental sense, the irreversible process of procuring independence for Namibia represents Africa's hope, pride, honour, prestige, dignity and beliefs. It stimulates expectations for the future, it is a bulwark against economic exploitation and political suppression, it is a safeguard for the cherished customs and traditions of Africa, and it engenders an aspiration to regional stability in that part of Africa. In short, the African continent's call symbolizes Namibia's intention and determination, sustained by the world's sympathy and support, to break away from a colonial situation characterized by economic exploitation, political suppression, social humiliation, racism and racial discrimination.

17. It is, therefore, on this basis that any direct or indirect support for or connivance with the vestiges of colonialism or racism in any form, is regarded as only putting salt on the wounds inflicted and is bound to remind Africans of an ignoble era during which they were dehumanized and deliberately relegated to the position of mere spectators in political life of the land of their birth, a land inherited from their ancestors. It also reminds Africans of an era during which African men were called mere "boys", and white racists callously and arrogantly regarded Africans as being servants "appointed by God" to be drawers of water and hewers of wood for the white people.

18. On an individual State basis, Malawi wholeheartedly supports self-determination and genuine independence for Namibia, and this stand stems from several factors, the principal of which are as follows.

19. First, historically, the people of Malawi are fully aware of and conversant with the humiliation suffered by any human being under a foreign Power. Malawians did not receive their independence on a silver platter; their political leaders were imprisoned, and many Malawians lost their lives for freedom and dignity. They were forced against their will into the political arms of a federal régime in the name of the dead Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, whose demise was engineered by the withdrawal of Malawi's membership from the federal arrangement by the Life President of Malawi on 31 December 1963.

20. Secondly, socially, Malawians were denied accommodation and food services in hotels or places of entertainment reserved for whites only. They were fourth-class citizens in the land of their birth. John McCracken, in a book called *Africa South of Sahara*, has observed that in Malawi "land alienation was extensive there; many Africans were made tenants at will with little or no legal right to the land they cultivated; all were subjected to the insults and tensions inherent in the growth of a colonial culture".

21. Thirdly, Malawi's rejection of colonialism was confirmed by Malawi's Life President, Ngwazi Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, when he addressed the General Assembly on 2 December 1964. He told the Assembly then: "Malawi hates colonialism . . . I personally believe just as strongly as any other African nationalist that colonialism is an evil which must be eradicated from every inch of our continent." [*1288th meeting, para. 63.*]

22. Fourthly, my country's abhorrence of any vestiges of colonialism has been institutionalized and incorporated into the Malawi Constitution, in which it has been stipulated that one of the principles upon which the Government of the Republic of Malawi is built is "recognition of the need for the ultimate unification of the peoples of Africa, for their common welfare and advancement".

23. Finally, as a staunch supporter of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, Malawi is also determined, like any African Member State in the General Assembly, "to eradicate all forms of colonialism from Africa".

24. Having spoken of my country's colonial experience and, in particular, its total commitment to independence for Namibia and the eradication of all traces of colonialism, I should like to refer to the substantive issue under consideration, which is independence for Namibia.

25. First, it will be recalled that South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia was terminated long ago and that, despite international appeals combined with considerable pressure to relinquish control over Namibia, South Africa continues to administer the Territory.

26. Negotiations on the independence of Namibia have been further complicated and checkmated by the linking of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola to the independence of Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Most of the Member States have rejected the linkage on the grounds that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola would seriously jeopardize the security of the Angolan Government; that the linkage infringes Angola's sovereignty and its right to seek military assistance from friendly countries; and that the linkage is not part of the internationally accepted provisions of resolution 435 (1978).

27. All resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, regrettably, remain buried in the archives of the United Nations, perhaps disturbingly, as a mere contribution towards the annals of history. In consequence, representatives are frustrated. Africa is bitter. The world community is impatient. Southern Africa lives with the problem and therefore it pleads for an immediate solution to that problem. Sorrowfully, Namibia bleeds. Namibians may well question us today in this vein: "What wrong have we done to suffer this penance?" On balance, the message is clear that independence for Namibia is overdue, and there is a perceptible atmosphere of an intolerable dilemma and acknowledgement of political inertia.

28. It is true and undeniable that the consultations that have taken place so far may provide a sort of mixture of hope and despair and that the political situation in Namibia looks grim. There is, however, still a grain of hope in knowing that Namibia is destined for political independence. As members know, it has been stated by some British political observers that politics is not only the art of the possible but also the art of making possible tomorrow what may be impossible today.

29. Secondly, although the contacts made between Angola and South Africa have not produced tangible results, the continuation of such negotiations may eventually accelerate the momentum of the search for a political solution to the dispute. In this connection, my delegation recalls that the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity declared at its fortieth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 27 February to 5 March 1984, that it "fully supports the efforts and measures undertaken by the Angolan Government, according to Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to guarantee and safeguard its territorial integrity and national sovereignty" [*see A/39/207, annex, resolution CM/Res.936 (XL)*].

30. Thirdly, my delegation wishes to express the hope that the consultations going on, some of which took place in Cape Verde recently, according to the documents circulated, might break the vicious circle of uncertainty surrounding the independence issue. Mr. Feldman of the United States delegation told the Fourth Committee in November 1984 that, at the request of the Government of Angola, the United States had conveyed to the South Africans certain official Angolan proposals of a specific nature, and that the South Africans had undertaken to study the proposals carefully and to provide a considered response before the end of November this year.

31. The President of the People's Republic of Angola, Mr. Eduardo dos Santos, has been quoted by the British Broadcasting Corporation as having said the following, on the ninth anniversary of Angola's independence, on 11 November 1984:

> "The platform we presented to the United States Government contains the following fundamental points: first, the conclusion of the withdrawal of the South African forces from Angola; second, the cessation of all kinds of support to UNITA puppets and the dismantling of their bases in Namibia; third, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibian independence; and fourth, after the deployment of the United Nations forces in Namibia and the reduction of South African forces to 1,500 infantry soldiers, the Governments of Angola and Cuba will initiate the gradual reduction of the Cuban international contingent on the basis of an agreed schedule."

32. *The New York Times*, on 17 November 1984, quoted a statement by the South African Foreign Minister as follows:

> "The discussions between South Africa and the United States concerning the proposals of the Angolan Government regarding the withdrawal of the Cubans and the reaction of South Africa to these proposals have been concluded.
>
> "The United States Government will convey the South African viewpoint to the Angolan Government as soon as possible, after which further bilateral discussions between South Africa and the United States are expected. It is also possible that trilateral discussions between the Republic of South Africa, the United States and Angola could follow."

33. The proposals of the Government of Angola and the response thereto by the Government of South Africa have been circulated in documents

A/39/688 and A/39/689, respectively, both of 26 November 1984.

34. Fourthly, my delegation noted with interest the meeting this year in Lusaka, which was attended by South African and SWAPO representatives. In the South African *Rand Daily Mail* of 1 October 1984 it was stated that "most white South Africans are in favour of direct negotiation between the Government and SWAPO, according to a recent survey conducted for the South African Institute of International Affairs".

35. In these circumstances, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to appeal to Member States to support the Secretary-General in his consultations with all parties concerned with a view to accelerating the independence of Namibia in accordance with the terms of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

36. It is clear from what I have just stated that my delegation completely supports self-determination and independence for Namibia, achieved through consultations or negotiations and on the basis of the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

37. The people of Namibia need self-determination and independence now, without further procrastination. We appeal to the world for moral, genuine commitment to the cause of Namibia. Malawi's hopes, intentions and determination are based on a rectangle of wishes: genuine independence for Namibia; peace and security for southern Africa, devoid of any traces of racism, racial discrimination or *apartheid;* economic development for the common benefit; and contact, dialogue and fruitful co-operation with the world at large. We want Namibia to share in that rectangle of wishes now. Yes, Namibia has been left out too long.

38. Nothing less will satisfy the people of Namibia; nothing more is demanded by them. They request only two things, and those are self-determination and independence, so that they can exercise their sovereign rights without consideration being given to race, creed, colour, national origin, sex, age or marital status. That is the gist of the debates today, whose impact crosses continental borders.

39. To the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka, we extend our most sincere congratulations on the efficient way he has steered and conducted the affairs of the Council.

40. In conclusion, my delegation would like to inform the Assembly that in a joint communiqué released on 23 October 1984 by the Life President of Malawi, Ngwazi Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, and the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Marshal Samora Moises Machel, the two leaders called for "the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which aims at achieving the self-determination and independence of the Namibian people". On the situation in Angola, the two leaders "expressed their solidarity with the Angolan people in the preservation of their sovereignty".

41. Mr. MBANZE (Mozambique): The General Assembly has considered the question of Namibia year after year. Once again we are gathered to consider ways and means to accelerate the process leading to the independence of Namibia. Indeed, the people of Namibia have for long lived under the yoke of domination, oppression and colonial exploitation. The people of Namibia have for long deserved peace, freedom and independence.

42. The representatives who have spoken before me have recognized that fact and expressed their concern over the prevailing situation in Namibia. They have unanimously condemned any manoeuvres aimed at perpetuating the colonial domination and exploitation of Namibia.

43. The occupation of that Territory by South Africa continues to be the main cause of the situation prevailing in the region. It is now 15 years since South Africa's presence in Namibia was declared illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and to the relevant decisions of the United Nations, as well as detrimental to the interests of the population of the Territory and those of the international community. The Security Council has adopted several resolutions, in particular resolutions 264 (1969) and 269 (1969), demanding firmly that South Africa withdraw from Namibia. However, my delegation notes with deep regret that these resolutions and decisions have been violated by South Africa throughout the past 15 years. South Africa arrogantly and shamelessly refuses to comply with the resolutions adopted by the international Organization, which is mandated under the Charter to be the guarantor of international peace and security.

44. What is at stake today is not only the dignity of the humiliated people of Namibia, whose right to self-determination and independence has been denied through South Africa's intransigence, but also the role of the United Nations as the trustee for Namibia.

45. One might wonder why South Africa has been able to challenge the decisions of this community of nations. As we understand it, this has been possible only because that régime enjoys the blessing and support of certain Member States. The co-operation of such States with South Africa, which extends to the military and nuclear domains, makes them accomplices in the crime of *apartheid* and in the continuing occupation of Namibia. These countries are responsible for the grave and explosive situation which prevails in Namibia. Each day that goes by we witness an increase in tension as well as in the number of deaths.

46. Despite the blatant intransigence of the South African régime, which refuses to comply with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the peace-loving countries have not ceased their efforts aimed at reaching a solution that can bring the occupation of Namibia to an end. This is the reason why all peoples that cherish peace and freedom and the international community as a whole welcomed Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In so doing, they were convinced that this resolution would finally lead to the self-determination and independence of Namibia. The fact that the resolution enjoyed universal consensus was the main reason for this strong belief.

47. The African States, the non-aligned countries and SWAPO mobilized all efforts with a view to implementing that resolution. However, all these efforts were frustrated because of South African intransigence. The result is that six years have already elapsed and no progress has been achieved so far. On the contrary, during this period extraneous issues have been introduced so as to undermine the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and delay the independence of Namibia. The so-called linkage or parallelism—or whatever one may call it—is one

of the most negative elements which has been raised, and it has blocked all positive efforts towards a just and speedy solution of the problem of Namibia.

48. The position of my Government with regard to the question of linkage is well known. We hold the view that the international community should resolutely and unequivocally reject the linkage of the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. As we have stated earlier, when resolution 435 (1978) was adopted the Cuban troops were already in Angola. At that time, none of the permanent members of the Security Council or any other Member of the United Nations established any linkage between these two issues.

49. The People's Republic of Angola is a sovereign country, a Member of the United Nations upon which the Charter bestows the sovereign right to appeal to every or any State in defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. Therefore, to demand that Cuban forces withdraw from Angola is interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State and an express act of complicity with South Africa, which persists in occupying Namibia. Those who should withdraw from Angola immediately and unconditionally are the South African troops that sow death and destruction in this sister country.

50. My delegation wishes to commend strongly the people and the Government of the People's Republic of Angola for the position they have taken recently towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in southern Africa. Angola has once more given proof of its goodwill, sense of responsibility and seriousness in seeking peace. It is now up to the other parties concerned to demonstrate their willingness to co-operate in order to bring about peace and stability to southern Africa. By taking this position, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola has made it increasingly clear to the international community that lack of progress in the process of independence for Namibia derives from the strong intransigence of the South African Government and those who support it. My Government reiterates its strong solidarity with the people and the Government of the People's Republic of Angola in their struggle to safeguard their sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.

51. Angola has taken a position of historical significance. Only those who do not respect the sacrifices made by the Angolan people during five bitter centuries of colonialism and during the armed struggle for national liberation can demand or expect more of the People's Republic of Angola.

52. The independence of Namibia is inevitable because the people of Namibia want it and are fighting for it. It is also inevitable because the struggle for Namibia's independence enjoys the support of the international community as well as world public opinion.

53. What the people of Namibia demand is that the United Nations continue and eventually intensify its efforts to accelerate the process leading to Namibia's independence. Let us not disappoint the people of Namibia, who are still under the colonial yoke in these days of our so-called civilized world.

54. History bears testimony to the United Nations capability and determination in handling decolonization matters. The United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, have to conceive practical measures commensurate with South African intransigence. The Security Council has to exercise decisively its authority to ensure the implementation of its resolutions and to bring about the independence of Namibia without further delay.

55. In conclusion, we reaffirm the unconditional support of the People's Republic of Mozambique for the people of Namibia and SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative. We also take this opportunity to commend the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General, as well as by the United Nations Council for Namibia, to ensure that the people of Namibia exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO.

56. The struggle continues.

57. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Eighteen years have elapsed since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and 13 years since the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971[2] on this question was handed down. However, the situation in Namibia today remains unchanged. The Namibian people are still under the yoke of illegal occupation and subjugation imposed through the most brutal means by the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria. It is, therefore, a matter of grave concern that South Africa is permitted to continue its abhorrent practices in Namibia in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and in disregard of the legitimate wishes of the people of Namibia.

58. During the past year, further efforts have been made by the international community to achieve a just and peaceful solution of the question of Namibia. The Secretary-General and various United Nations agencies and bodies, in particular the United Nations Council for Namibia—under your presidency, Sir—continue untiringly to perform their important roles in order that the just aspirations of the Namibian people may be realized. These worthy efforts, however, have made little progress, owing to the arrogance and intransigence of the Pretoria régime. As long as the oppressive régime maintains its stranglehold on the life of the hard-pressed population, the situation will worsen, and the international community must maintain its support for the legitimate struggle of the people, led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO. The struggle will indeed continue until the people of Namibia have achieved their rights, including the right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

59. My delegation also shares the deep concern of the international community over the rapid and unjustifiable depletion of Namibia's wealth of natural resources, in contravention of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974. The illegal exploitation, amounting to pillage, of such resources constitutes one of the obstacles to the achievement of a peaceful solution, thus thwarting attainment of the long-cherished goal of independence. It must, therefore, be brought to a speedy end, with prompt and just compensation.

60. My delegation also joins the overwhelming number of delegations in denouncing South Africa's insistence on so-called linkage of the question of

Namibia to the extraneous issue of Cuban troops in Angola. To all intents and purposes, this so-called linkage serves to delay the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and can be regarded only as a delaying tactic which will only prolong the agony of the oppressed Namibian people. The Thai delegation once again condemns in the strongest terms the attempts by the *apartheid* régime to impose a so-called internal settlement on Namibia, in violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions. By the same token, we completely reject the so-called "Multi-Party Conference" as a nefarious means of retaining the illegal control and domination of South Africa over Namibia, as well as the policies and practices of *apartheid* and the so-called homelands in the Territory. My delegation once again urges the Western contact group to exert genuine efforts towards the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan by all parties concerned.

61. For its part, the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand will continue to observe any development with active interest, since Thailand had the privilege and pleasure of hosting the extraordinary plenary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia at Bangkok, at which the Bangkok Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [*A/39/24, part two, chap. III, sect. B*], were adopted on 25 May 1984. Thailand's consistent stand on self-determination and humanitarianism will ensure that the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand will maintain its steadfast support for the people of Namibia in their quest for sovereignty and independence in a united Namibia.

62. Mr. HENAR (Suriname): The question of Namibia has been a subject of discussions in the United Nations ever since the inception of the Organization. The current session of the General Assembly indeed marks the thirty-ninth year that this issue has been on the international agenda. Eighteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and the United Nations assumed responsibility over the Territory of Namibia. Six years have now passed since the Security Council endorsed the United Nations settlement plan in its resolution 435 (1978), which provides for a peaceful transition to majority rule in Namibia through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Unfortunately, in spite of these and other efforts to secure the decolonization of Namibia, its independence is still held to ransom by the racist régime in Pretoria. The fact that the situation prevailing in Namibia continues to prevent its peaceful and speedy transition to majority rule is due entirely to the intransigence of the expansionist régime of South Africa.

63. The majority of preceding speakers have forthrightly condemned South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its aggression against neighbouring States. We cannot but agree with this position.

64. The international community has recently witnessed an acceleration by South Africa of the relentless plunder of Namibia's natural resources. The application by that same Pretoria régime of racist policies is not just a case of violence by a minority against a majority, but amounts to utter contempt and lack of respect for the people living under this system and, not least, is a clear expression of the economic exploitation of blacks in Namibia and South Africa.

65. My delegation denounces the puppet Multi-Party Conference as yet another attempt in a series of political manoeuvres through which Pretoria tries to impose a neo-colonialist settlement in Namibia. We therefore maintain that Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in which the Council endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, is the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. Consequently we urge its unconditional implementation, without qualification, amendment or the introduction of extraneous and irrelevant issues of linkage, parallelism or reciprocity, which not only delay the process of the decolonization of Namibia, but also constitute reprehensible and gross interference in the internal affairs of neighbouring States. The linkage policy is another excuse to block the termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia.

66. My delegation strongly opposes the recent imposition by the racist régime of South Africa of compulsory registration for military training by all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 for service in its army of occupation in Namibia. We call upon the South African Government to rescind this untimely and provocative measure.

67. My delegation regrets to state that the policy of "constructive engagement", which is geared towards the persuasion of South Africa to accept a settlement by assuring that an independent Namibian Government would be one with which Pretoria could live, has had an adverse effect and has consequently failed. We are deeply concerned at the dilatory tactics employed by the South African Government to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to impose an internal neo-colonial settlement on its people. We reiterate our conviction that the only fair and just settlement of the Namibian question will be one that falls within the framework of the United Nations settlement plan.

68. My delegation once again appeals to the international community for its staunch and unswerving support for the just struggle of the Namibian people and wishes to pay tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for carrying out the functions entrusted to it as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until its independence and for its tireless efforts in keeping the issue in the forefront of the world scene.

69. We also reaffirm our support for, solidarity with, and commitment to the heroic people of Namibia, to SWAPO, which is the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and to the African National Congress of South Africa, the representative of the majority of the people of South Africa, in their valiant struggle to eradicate *apartheid* and to bring freedom, justice and independence.

70. We cannot conclude without paying tribute to Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, who addressed the General Assembly on 29 November [*78th meeting*], and other SWAPO leaders, who have spent many years of their lives in prisons and concentration camps in Namibia and in South Africa, in their struggle for the eradication of colonialism and racism and the achievement of self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia.

71. Finally, on behalf of my delegation may I express the hope, or rather the conviction, that the

day is not too distant when Namibia will take its rightful place among us here in the United Nations.

72. Mrs. CARRASCO MONJE (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, permit me to express my delegation's gratitude to you and to other members of the United Nations Council for Namibia for your tireless efforts devoted to achieving the much desired freedom and independence for the Namibian people.

73. The people of Bolivia, whose past is marked by the glory of a heroic and tireless struggle to attain independence and self-determination, identifies with the noble cause of a people still living under colonial domination, and wishes to reiterate its firm resolve to support all measures deemed necessary by the United Nations to end South African colonial domination of that Territory.

74. It is regrettable that after long years and many efforts the United Nations has not yet achieved the emancipation of Namibia, owing to South Africa's persistent refusal to abide by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and respect various relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. This illegal occupation by a foreign colonial Power and the continued suffering inflicted upon a people are an affront to every concept of justice and equality.

75. The relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), in our view continue to be the only acceptable basis for a solution. Hence, my delegation will continue supporting them and will refuse to accept any other solution aimed at delaying their implementation or at introducing extraneous elements.

76. Subsequently, in its resolution 539 (1983) the Security Council condemned South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its defiance of resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, its obstruction of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) by insisting on conditions contrary to the provisions of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and rejected the insistence of the Government of Pretoria on linking the independence of Namibia to unacceptable conditions. This resolution, which was adopted in 1983, did not produce a favourable response in South Africa. On the contrary, South Africa continues illegally to occupy the Territory and to exploit its natural resources indiscriminately.

77. It is also important to note the statements of the Prime Minister of South Africa, who has said that his Government cannot change, nor will it ever change its position with respect to the Cuban withdrawal, and that in the meantime it is obvious that the people of South West Africa, including SWAPO, cannot wait indefinitely for the solution to the Cuban question in order to make considerable progress, but meanwhile the political parties, including SWAPO, could reach an agreement with respect to the future of the country and South Africa would not oppose the implementation of such an agreement. These statements show clearly that South Africa continues to seek ways and means in which to delay the implementation of United Nations resolutions. These attempts at delay should be rejected, since they do not relate to the independence, freedom and self-determination of the Namibian people.

78. My delegation wishes to express its satisfaction at the adoption on 25 May 1984 at the extraordinary plenary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia of the Bangkok Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [*ibid.*], which reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination; express solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people; and condemn the South African régime for its ruthless repression, its policy and practice of *apartheid* and for its flagrant violations of human rights perpetrated against the people of Namibia.

79. Similarly, they reaffirm full support for the resolutions stating that Walvis Bay and the offshore islands are an integral part of Namibia and that any South African measure aimed at separating them from the Territory is illegal, and null and void. For Bolivia, a nation which has been the victim of territorial depredations, it is essential to uphold the principle of territorial integrity. Consequently, we oppose any attempt by South Africa to annex territories which legitimately belong to Namibia.

80. Many peoples have attained independence and today have a place in the United Nations as free countries and masters of their own destiny. Nevertheless, we should not forget that the situation with regard to Namibia continues to stagnate, which means that we must intensify our efforts to ensure that the Government of South Africa changes its policy and complies with United Nations resolutions. Otherwise, this situation will constitute a serious threat to the stability of the African continent and jeopardize international peace and security, in addition to challenging the very credibility of the United Nations.

81. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): Namibia continues to be firmly under the military occupation of *apartheid* South Africa, although the General Assembly decided 18 years ago, in 1966, to terminate that régime's Mandate over Namibia. The United Nations has yet to assume its full and effective responsibility over Namibia, in order to enable the oppressed Namibian people to be free in terms of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI).

82. The *apartheid* régime's illegal occupation of Namibia and its repression and economic exploitation of that country's population and natural resources have continued, in brazen defiance of the numerous decisions and resolutions of the Assembly, the Security Council, the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries—in other words, in defiance of the entire international community. This is scandalous and intolerable. How and why should that pariah régime be allowed arrogantly to flout international common sense, consensus and demands for the peaceful liberation of the people of Namibia? What is the response of the United Nations to the challenge of the Boers? For, indeed, the Pretoria régime, both by its statements and by its deeds, has made it abundantly clear that it has opted for a military or violent rather than a peaceful path to Namibia's freedom. If the international community was slow to understand this message, the oppressed and suffering Namibians were not. Thus, realizing the obstinate and violent nature of their military colonizers, the Namibians decided to take to arms and declared their national liberation struggle, under the direction of SWAPO, their sole and authentic liberation movement and representative. SWAPO, as this Assembly knows, is

committed to the liberation of Namibia and the ultimate attainment by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination.

83. Again, as is well known, in opting for armed struggle as the most appropriate response to the challenge presented by the illegal régime's obstinacy and intransigence, SWAPO and the Namibian masses did not slam the door on a peaceful solution to the Namibian colonial question. In this regard, no one can doubt SWAPO's sincerity in lending maximum support and co-operation to the United Nations search for a formula and political framework within which a peaceful settlement to the question could be worked out. For instance, when, in 1978, the Security Council produced what is now widely known and internationally accepted as the United Nations plan for Namibia, as endorsed in resolution 435 (1978), SWAPO and the people of Namibia expressed their support for it, despite its obvious flaws and the fact that militarily their struggle was gaining greater momentum.

84. The United Nations plan for Namibia of 1978 came about as the result of the negotiating and diplomatic efforts of the group of countries known as the Western contact group. A great deal of attention was paid to the sensitivities of the Pretoria régime during the negotiations. When in 1978 the plan was announced to the world with great fanfare, the Pretoria régime had scrutinized and approved every word and punctuation mark in it. The people of Namibia, the front-line States and, indeed, the entire international community were also obliged to accept the plan as the only realistic basis for a peaceful settlement to the Namibian colonial question.

85. Yet, six years later—today—the plan not only remains unimplemented but is in dire danger of being undermined and overthrown by some of its very authors. It is not my intention to bore the Assembly by cataloguing events perpetrated by Pretoria subsequent to the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia, as the list is only too well known to all gathered here. Suffice it to emphasize that during this period from 1978 to the present, Pretoria has been prolific in creating one demand or pretext after another to delay and even obstruct the Security Council's and the Secretary-General's efforts to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia. First, the régime complained in 1980 that it did not have confidence in the United Nations and said that it harboured certain reservations regarding the composition of UNTAG, as envisaged in the plan. Absurd and arrogant as these reservations were, the Western contact group, the front-line States and the United Nations agreed to address them, and this was done to the apparent satisfaction of the occupation régime. Thus, in January 1981 the pre-implementation meeting was convened in Geneva, under the auspices and chairmanship of the United Nations, to set in gear the process of implementing the United Nations plan. All that was required then of the two parties—the Pretoria régime and SWAPO—was for each to declare its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement and to agree to the immediate implementation of the plan, as approved in resolution 435 (1978).

86. As is well known, the failure of the Geneva meeting was caused entirely by the behaviour of the Pretoria occupation régime. Whereas at the outset the President of the South West Africa People's Organization, Comrade Sam Nujoma, declared his movement's readiness to sign a cease-fire accord with South Africa, and also agreed to the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the régime's delegation made it clear on 13 January 1981, the day before the break-up of the Meeting, that South Africa was not prepared to co-operate with the United Nations in the effort to implement the plan.

87. It was not a secret—and this too is well known—that in its defiant and arrogant behaviour South Africa counted on and did get the protection of some Western countries which are also members of the contact group. Indeed, the numerous mixed signals from the capitals of those countries assured Pretoria that those Governments would frustrate any punitive measures which the Security Council might contemplate taking against the Pretoria régime. In fact, soon after the abortive Geneva meeting, the spokesmen of the Governments of the contact group countries began to talk more and more about the need to "strengthen" resolution 435 (1978)—implying, of course, that the United Nations plan should be revised. Naturally, SWAPO, the front-line States and Nigeria found this to be totally unacceptable. Our rejection of this line of action was later endorsed by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the OAU, which all demanded and insisted upon the implementation of the plan, without delay, prevarication, qualification or modification.

88. Since August 1982, the dilatory strategem of Pretoria has been articulated in terms of the notorious policy of linkage, by which South Africa has insisted and continues to insist on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, as a pre-condition for its co-operation in the United Nations plan.

89. The front-line States and, subsequently, the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April 1983, and the nineteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa in June 1983, rejected totally this policy of linkage, or parallelism, as the policy is also called. By its resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council also condemned and rejected this and any other attempt to link irrelevant issues to the Namibian independence equation.

90. Linkage has been condemned and rejected not only because of its irrelevance to the Namibian question but also because it represents blatant interference in the internal and external affairs of the sovereign States of Angola and Cuba, which are Member States of the United Nations. Moreover, linkage is also a rude and arrogant smokescreen for Pretoria's own aggression against and continued military occupation of part of Angola's territory. The General Assembly must insist, as it has done in the past, upon South Africa's immediate and unconditional co-operation with the Secretary-General's efforts to implement the United Nations plan. We must also demand the regime's immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its forces from southern Angola.

91. The Organization cannot be indifferent to or tolerate the cheek and arrogance of the Pretoria régime, which are geared towards shifting the respon-

sibility for delaying Namibia's freedom onto Angola, a country which in fact has been a victim of that régime's continuous naked aggression since 1975. It must not be forgotten that Angola requested Cuban assistance in defending its territorial integrity from Pretoria's own brutal and criminal aggression, which continues to threaten the very existence of Angola.

92. We condemn and denounce in the strongest terms Pretoria's aggression against Angola, in particular, and its policy of regional destabilization in general.

93. Finally, we must repeat our views with regard to the policy of appeasement which some countries are pursuing and which they would have the international community believe will make a favourable impression on the pariah régime of *apartheid* Pretoria. We totally reject that policy and would like to warn very strongly against such a fallacious and misguided view of the Pretoria régime. That racist régime, like its Nazi and Fascist predecessors and inspirers four and a half decades ago, is impervious to and very contemptuous of reason and common sense. Like its predecessors, it has decidedly and firmly put itself in opposition to international law and civilized standards.

94. We are convinced, therefore, that no amount of appeasement or, as it is euphemistically called in certain capitals, constructive engagement, will alter Pretoria's destructive and deadly nature. For our part, we in Zimbabwe have chosen to side with and support the internal victims of *apartheid* and the people of Namibia in their struggle for liberation and self-determination. We cannot hobnob with *apartheid* and aggression. We will, instead, continue to oppose, denounce and reject this evil with all the means at our disposal.

95. Mr. KIILU (Kenya): Once again, the General Assembly is faced not with the question of Namibia but with the problem of what to do about the arrogant and blatant refusal of the racist régime of South Africa to vacate Namibia, 18 years after adopting its resolution 2145 (XXI), by which it terminated South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia, a decision the validity of which was subsequently confirmed by the International Court of Justice.

96. In the consideration of this item, it is important to recall that this is the centenary year of the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for national liberation and independence. The history of the enormous sacrifices made by the Namibian people during that bitter struggle is too well documented to need repeating here. Therefore, the immediate task before us today is to find a way to overcome the one obstacle to Namibia's independence, namely racist South Africa's intransigence.

97. Kenya has stated before, and we wish to reiterate now, that Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without any modification, qualification or equivocation, remains the only basis for the independence of Namibia. We are encouraged that the vast majority of the Members of the Organization share that view. Unfortunately, some have allowed themselves to be hoodwinked by South Africa's delaying tactics and cunning manoeuvres, under various guises, to undermine resolution 435 (1978), including previous attempts to convene the so-called "Multi-Party Conference" to write a constitution for independent Namibia. Kenya believes that the task of framing a constitution for independent Namibia belongs to the gallant Namibians alone, under the direction of SWAPO, their sole and legitimate representative.

98. As Kenya stated on 4 September 1981, at the 3rd meeting of the eighth emergency special session devoted to Namibia, the facts are clear and unambiguous, namely: first, South Africa is in Namibia illegally; secondly, responsibility for the administration of Namibia until independence legally rests with the United Nations; thirdly, in exercise of its legal responsibility over Namibia and consistent with the Charter provision concerning the settlement of all disputes by peaceful means, the United Nations has adopted a plan for Namibia's independence, as endorsed by resolution 435 (1978); and fourthly, South Africa has defied that Security Council resolution, resulting in no progress being made towards its implementation.

99. Kenya contends that what is at stake here is the authority and status of the United Nations itself. Throughout the many years that have elapsed, SWAPO and the African States have been urged to show co-operation, flexibility and moderation. In this long process many concessions have been made, and in return we have witnessed an even more determined intransigence on the part of the racist régime. As we all know, racist South Africa has continued its brutal and illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant violation of international law and international public opinion. South Africa has similarly continued to defy the United Nations and to violate the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination. Moreover, by its policy of destabilization of neighbouring States and its massive military build-up, which is far in excess of its legitimate defence needs, the racist régime poses a threat to international peace and security.

100. We suggested at the beginning of this statement that the problem before us was racist South Africa. The question may, therefore, be asked how one State, however powerful, can for ever defy the will of the international community with impunity. Kenya believes that no country, not even the brutal racist régime of South Africa, could do so without the connivance and support of certain countries. South Africa should not be allowed, aided or encouraged to defy the United Nations at the expense of the national liberation and independence of Namibia. Therefore, we strongly appeal to friends of that racist régime, whose investments, supply of arms, communication links and high technology insulate it from the effects of United Nations resolutions, to withdraw their support from the régime until such time as it complies with and honours decisions reached by the international community, including its close friends and allies.

101. It is the strong conviction of my delegation that unless and until all of us demonstrate by deeds, not by mere words, that we mean to practise what we preach, it would be futile to expect the obstinate tyrants in Pretoria to respect our resolutions. In this context, my delegation welcomes the various reports called for in resolutions 38/36 A to E adopted at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly on this question [*item 36*]. At this juncture, my delegation wishes to pay a special tribute to the Secretary-General for the constructive role he has played in this matter. Our appreciation also goes to the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with

regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. A. G. Koroma of Sierra Leone, for the efforts that Committee continues to exert in the struggle for the independence of Namibia.

102. Following its assumption of direct legal responsibility for Namibia in 1966, the General Assembly, at its fifth special session, held in 1967, established the United Nations Council for Namibia pursuant to its resolution 2248 (S-V) and designated it the legal Administering Authority for Namibia. In its 17 years of existence the Council has discharged its important task with commendable dedication.

103. My delegation takes this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to you, Sir, in your capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, for the courageous and conscientious manner in which you have led the Council. We also commend the Vice-President of the Council, the representative of Turkey, for his eloquent presentation of the report of the Council [*78th meeting*] now before us.

104. Kenya is committed to supporting the national liberation and independence of Namibia. Therefore, we fully support the United Nations Council for Namibia in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority until that Territory attains its independence in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). In this regard, we note with satisfaction the many achievements of the Council during the year now drawing to a close. In particular, we wish to underscore the importance for the Namibian people of the Council's activities aimed at protecting and preserving the natural resources of that Territory from the plundering of the racist régime and other hungry Powers. Similarly, Kenya believes that mobilization of international support for Namibia through seminars, symposia and the mass media should be maintained and greatly intensified. Therefore we approve of the programme of work envisaged for the Council for next year as contained in its report [*see A/39/24*].

105. My delegation has also taken note of the note by the Secretary-General [*A/39/582*] concerning the comprehensive programme of assistance to States that are neighbours of South Africa and Namibia, called for in paragraph 37 of General Assembly resolution 38/36 A. My delegation endorses the approach the Secretary-General intends to adopt in his implementation of that aspect of the resolution.

106. I wish to conclude this statement by recalling that there are only three interested parties in this critical question, namely: the struggling and gallant people of Namibia, represented by SWAPO, their sole and legitimate representative; the oppressive racist régime of South Africa, which continues to occupy Namibia in defiance of world public opinion; and the international community, represented by the United Nations, which has direct legal responsibility for Namibia. However, it is paradoxical that, although SWAPO, as the sole representative of the Namibian people, and the United Nations, acting as the conscience and will of the international community, have both spared no effort to achieve a peaceful settlement of the problem, the racist régime of South Africa, itself in Namibia illegally, has instead intensified its arrogant brutality and defiance. Yet the reasons for this intolerant behaviour are not far to seek. It is well known that, despite many United Nations resolutions calling for the isolation of the racist régime, including Security Council resolution 418 (1977), imposing an embargo on arms shipments to South Africa, friends of the Pretoria régime, notably certain Western nations, have continued military and economic collaboration with that country. Indeed, there are reliable reports that co-operation with South Africa has embraced even the nuclear field.

107. In these circumstances, we are convinced that all possible peaceful and voluntary means of making South Africa get out of Namibia have been exhausted without positive results. We are, therefore, of the firm view that the international community, through the Assembly, has only one option left, namely, the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. We are convinced that, in order to be effective, such sanctions must be both comprehensive and mandatory. Therefore, Kenya calls upon the Security Council to shoulder and discharge its primary responsibility under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

108. Mr. NIARE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): Once again, the debate on the question of Namibia reminds us of the realities of a situation which is as tragic as it is dangerous for international peace and security.

109. Once again, the entire world sees grave consequences flowing from the policy of illegal occupation, aggression and expansion of the racist régime of South Africa.

110. Once again, the international community takes note of the Pretoria régime's persistent refusal to comply with the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

111. Namibia remains under the yoke of illegal occupation, in violation of international law and of the judgement of the world conscience. The *apartheid* régime, the last bastion of colonialism in Africa, is founded on injustice and oppression, as well as on expansionist ambitions, and it violates with impunity the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries. That régime not only threatens the peoples of southern Africa, not only adversely affects the stability and security of neighbouring States, but is characterized, in its policy of *apartheid*, and in its manifestations and evolution, by attempts permanently to destabilize Africa. In other words, that policy, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, poses a threat to international peace and security. That policy of destabilization is a challenge to independent Africa, but it is also an arrogant reply to the international community. It is an impermissible reaction to the repeated relevant decisions of the United Nations.

112. Since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa, which has correctly become Namibia, the *apartheid* régime has continued to oppose with impunity the international consensus condemning both its fundamental thesis and the criminal forms it takes both within and outside the country.

113. In this connection, my delegation believes that it is time to put an end to the warlike, expansionist and colonialist activities of South Africa, which, on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, continues, as in the past, calmly to plunder the resources of Namibia.

114. My delegation is convinced that to bring the struggle of the Namibian people to a successful

conclusion it is becoming increasingly necessary and urgent to impose on South Africa the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in keeping, moreover, with the relevant decisions of the Security Council.

115. The *apartheid* régime's challenge is a challenge to our collective conscience. It emphasizes the inability of the United Nations, and above all the Security Council, to take effective decisions.

116. All that is necessary, therefore, is for all States Members of the United Nations—especially certain of them which continue to give comfort and support to the racist minority régime of South Africa through tacit complicity and active co-operation—scrupulously to respect the international status of the Territory of Namibia. That means that all those States must agree to the full and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the basis for a final settlement of the question of Namibia. My delegation cannot say too often that the stability of an entire region and of international peace and security is at stake.

117. Nor can we over-emphasize what the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation of Mali stated in the general debate. He said:

> "The presence of South Africa in Namibia is an insult to history, to logic and to the lofty purposes set forth in the Charter. It is in the common interest to isolate and destroy the hateful system of *apartheid* by all available diplomatic, cultural, economic and, above all, military means, in keeping with the relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. Thus, history will one day reproach us for having tolerated this abject system for so long and in so shameful a way, and mankind will not have to suffer another mistake with incalculable consequences." [*29th meeting, para. 78.*]

118. Africa, which is struggling for total liberation, must have the benefit of effective and ever more active support from all those that consider the ideals of peace, fundamental freedoms, the defence of human rights, and friendship with the African peoples to be profound aspirations of democracy and civilization.

119. Active solidarity with the African peoples, especially those of southern Africa; a consistent demand for the ending of dangerous and reprehensible alliances with a universally condemned régime; true, sincere commitment to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations: these are the ways and means to contribute seriously to the restoration of peace and stability in that region of the world.

120. The restoration of peace and stability in that region of the world will put an end to an explosive situation. It will destroy the last bastion of colonialism in Africa and, above all, end the subjugation of a people and the organized plunder of its resources.

121. In order to ensure independence for Namibia, the international community must strengthen its military and diplomatic support for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Thanks to their courage, determination and clear-sightedness, the valiant SWAPO fighters have established themselves over the years as the sole authentic parties to the negotiations which will lead Namibia to independence and sovereignty.

122. In supporting without reservation the many efforts and initiatives all over the world aimed at putting an end to the actions of the Pretoria régime, which are a disgrace and a challenge to morality, Mali, in keeping with the resolutions of the United Nations, will spare no effort to ensure the effective adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria.

123. We are more deeply convinced than ever of the imperative need for active international solidarity with the oppressed peoples of southern Africa in order to put an end to the intolerable situation of injustice and terror in that region. South Africa, which continues illegally to occupy the international Territory of Namibia, has engaged in a series of manoeuvres to impede the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), concerning the independence of Namibia. Profiting from the barely concealed support of certain Western Powers, the racist minority régime has become increasingly arrogant and intransigent in its defiance of the authority of the United Nations and its contempt for any peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, despite the numerous concessions made by SWAPO.

124. Like the failure of the Geneva conference, that of the Lusaka conference last May attests to the bad faith of the Pretoria racists. We cannot fail to see that the South African racists' attempts at an internal settlement have failed. The Namibian people, who have taken up arms to liberate their homeland, will never accept a neo-colonial solution that imposes on them a puppet Government composed of internal parties.

125. It is more important than ever for all those who cherish peace and justice to step up their material, financial and military assistance to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, in its just struggle to regain the independence and territorial integrity of its homeland.

126. Similarly, they must give their unswerving support to the front-line States to enable them to defend their territorial integrity and sovereignty against the South African racists' attempts at destabilization.

127. Mali has followed with genuine interest the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which you, Sir, guide with such skill and dedication, in the search for a solution to the question of Namibia.

128. With reference to the documents before us, my delegation wishes to highlight the importance and high quality of United Nations action in the interest of decolonization. That action must continue, for the right of peoples to freedom, justice and self-determination is universal, inalienable and imprescriptible. It is the right of the Namibian people as well.

129. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): The issue of independence for Namibia is as old as the United Nations itself. I hope that when we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Organization we shall also celebrate the independence of Namibia. The question of Namibia will continue to test the credibility and moral commitment of the world community. We deplore the impunity with which the racist régime in South Africa continues its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, which represents the most abhorrent form of colonialism experienced by mankind.

130. The extensive participation of delegations in this debate demonstrates the international commu-

nity's strong support for the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence as envisaged in the United Nations plan for Namibia.

131. The Government of Papua New Guinea rejects South Africa's recent attempt to bring about a so-called internal settlement and reiterates its conviction that a just and comprehensive solution can only be brought about through the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We recall and support Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which nullified all such extraneous or irrelevant issues as the linkage of Cuban troops to Namibia's independence.

132. South Africa continues scornfully to reject the numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. It continues to impose its inhumane, repressive and exploitative policies against the will of the native people of Namibia. We condemn the illegal detention of political prisoners and the introduction of conscription of Namibians to fight against their own brothers and sisters.

133. The racist Government continues to exploit both the people and the rich mineral and other resources of the Territory. Moreover, it is particularly deplorable that some influential Member States are co-operating with the *apartheid* régime in the economic plunder of Namibia. Such collaboration can only encourage South Africa's intransigence. We, therefore, reiterate the call upon those States to cease forthwith all political, economic, social and military links with the racist Government of South Africa.

134. The increasing South African military build-up and operations on Namibian territory, as well as the use of the territory as a launching-pad, pose an immediate and serious threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States neighbouring South Africa. We support dialogue among the interested Governments on security-related issues, with the aim of reducing tensions in the region.

135. I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate Papua New Guinea's support for the people of Namibia in their just struggle under the able leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. We commend SWAPO's constructiveness and its continued co-operation with the United Nations.

136. My delegation expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his continuing efforts towards a final resolution of the Namibian question. We wish also to thank the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for its report and the decision contained therein [*A/39/23, chap. IX, sect. B*] and to assure it of our support.

137. We would also like to praise the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, under your leadership, Mr. President, as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory. We support the recommendations in the Council's report [*A/39/24, part four, chap. I*].

138. In conclusion, my delegation reiterates its call for the unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory of Namibia and emphasizes that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides the most comprehensive plan for Namibia's independence, which we hope will be achieved in 1985. Namibia's independence is inevitable and cannot be delayed any longer. We urge all parties concerned to be constructive in their efforts towards this goal. The onus is on the United Nations to act decisively and with unity to translate the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people into reality.

139. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): Those of us who genuinely care for and support the people of Namibia in their effort to free their country are faced with a difficult dilemma. During the last four decades must has been said and much has been written about that situation. In fact, so much has been said and so much has been written that it strains the imagination to conceive of new words on this subject. What new arguments can be developed? What new logic can be presented? What new reasoning can be articulated? What new phrases can somehow open the hearts of South Africa's rulers? What new expressions can open the minds of those that have it in their power to ease the task of freeing Namibia but choose not to exercise that power?

140. Have not the people of Namibia been patient enough? Have they not exercised enough restraint and moderation? Have they not earned our respect and gratitude for their adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations? Have they ever attacked South Africa? Have they ever terrorized anyone? What about guarantees of their safety and security? What about their national interests? For how many more years must they wait? Can anyone tell us when South Africa will finally leave them and their country alone and let them live and develop in peace?

141. South Africa's occupation of Namibia has been researched, analysed, discussed, debated, regretted, condemned and even damned. Yet it has continued.

142. Sceptics say that all our words, all our expressions of indignation, all our righteous condemnations and all our resolutions have been in vain. They point to South Africa's increased military strength, its ability to destabilize neighbouring States, its ability and its willingness to terrorize its own citizenry and that of neighbouring countries and its ability to translate its military and economic might into what passes for diplomatic acceptance.

143. These sceptics tell us that South Africa is a reality on the African continent. They point to that society's material achievements rather than its human failures. They tell us that South Africa will never be defeated militarily and that no changes or concessions are possible without guarantees and assurances that will aid and comfort Pretoria.

144. The sceptics are not 100 per cent wrong. In the epic of human history, there are very few absolutes. Of course South Africa is a reality on the African continent. Every thinking person knows that. What is yet to be determined is the type of reality.

145. Will it be a reality that respects all peoples and cultures and permits them to realize their full human potential? Or will it be the dubious reality of naked military might and narrow racist theological fiction? Will it be a reality of the future or a reality of the past?

146. The people of Namibia, the vast majority of the people of South Africa and member States of the OAU are as realistic as is humanly possible. Their fondest wish is for a South Africa that is a reality of the future. Pretoria knows that South Africa's contin-

ued existence is not at issue. Pretoria knows that South Africa's continued prosperity and development are not at issue. Pretoria knows what the issues really are, just as every rational, thinking person knows what is at stake.

147. To the sceptics, inside and outside South Africa, we say that we have more faith in the future of that country than they do. Our efforts have not been in vain. We believe that South Africa and all South Africans will, in the long run, benefit more from an independent Namibia than from a colonized Namibia.

148. We believe that South Africa itself and all South Africans will be richer, truly richer, when the doors of opportunity are open for all, regardless of race, religion, sex or class. We believe that no society can survive which concerns itself solely with the acquisition of material wealth while choosing to ignore its spiritual growth and the development of its human resources. South Africa, like any other society, can only thrive and benefit from a population which challenges it and dares it to live up to its promises and its pronouncements.

149. SWAPO and the supporters of Namibian independence are the only ones who can claim to be realistic in this debate. Year after year and at conference after conference, they have pointed the way towards a just and equitable solution to one of our most vexing problems. It was not SWAPO which injected violence into the campaign for Namibia's independence. It was not SWAPO which introduced external forces and extraneous issues into the discussions on Namibia's future. Nor is it SWAPO which erects new barriers just as it appears that progress towards a negotiated settlement is at hand.

150. If South Africa wishes the armed conflict to end, it is in South Africa's power to end the conflict. If sceptics continue to insist that South Africa is militarily invincible, then SWAPO will be compelled to demonstrate its ability to play David to South Africa's Goliath.

151. I must confess that we are at a loss to understand why SWAPO's relative moderation and restraint are not rewarded by increased pressure on Pretoria to respond in kind. We have always believed in dialogue and negotiations to resolve political impasse. It is our belief that no situation is too complex and no impasse need be permanent. However, when one party's actions are as patently illegal as are the actions of South Africa, then there must be a question concerning the type of inducements offered to gain a cessation of the criminal activities. How can the victim be asked to prove its good intentions to the criminal?

152. We share the international community's frustration over the obstacles which have been placed in the path of Namibia's independence. We are disappointed that the promise of progress is still unfulfilled.

153. In a few short weeks, our work here in New York will conclude and we shall adjourn this session of the General Assembly. Most of us will travel to our respective homes to share time and memories with our loved ones. Some of us will take part in religious or spiritual observances. Some of us will enjoy seasonal festivities and others will simply rest and recuperate.

154. For our friends from Namibia, however, there will be no rest or recuperation. There will be little joy and few festivities. Their country is still occupied. Their families are in many cases still divided. Their task—and ours—remains unfinished.

155. They know that the international community is with them. But in this case we must ask: Is that enough? Is there not more that we can do? Is there not more that we can offer? All of us must pose these questions and search for an answer. Some must search deeper than others, for they have a greater ability to influence events than do most of us.

156. For our part, we offer no easy prescriptions, no magical solutions and no sure remedies. South Africa is a difficult, intransigent adversary. Everyone knows this, but none knows it better than South Africa's immediate victims.

157. To SWAPO and the people of Namibia we renew our support and encouragement. We share their anguish, their goals and their optimism. We wish we could do more.

158. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The people of Namibia continue to wait for the inexorable attainment of their historical destiny as a free and independent State in the territory that belongs to them legally.

159. For almost 20 years, South Africa has been illegally occupying and exploiting Namibia solely by the force of arms. Similarly, for four decades now the United Nations has been ceaselessly working for the elimination of one of the last but perhaps the most explosive and denigrating vestiges of colonialism in the world. I stress these characteristics strongly because in the time that has elapsed, the thwarting of the rights of the Namibian people has been and still is linked to the inhuman, abhorrent practice of institutionalized racism.

160. The consideration of the question of Namibia at this thirty-ninth session has been lengthy and intense and the extraordinary level of participation by States Members of the Organization clearly demonstrates the total commitment of the international community to the self-determination and independence of Namibia and the overwhelming, unswerving political will to take the necessary steps to ensure immediate exercise of those inalienable rights. We must, however, deplore that that will is not yet unanimous and that there are interests of various kinds, including those involved in the global confrontation, which some would attempt to introduce into the irreversible process of the decolonization of South West Africa.

161. My delegation wishes to reaffirm the well-known position of Peru on this item, and I should like to emphasize the following points.

162. First, the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) should be implemented without further delay. Its provisions, which set forth the means whereby the inhabitants of Namibia can freely determine their future, under United Nations supervision and control, deserve our full support. It must be remembered that the occupying Power itself accepted those provisions and knowingly accepted responsibility for their implementation. So there is no explanation whatsoever for non-compliance except the uncompromising and aggressive attitude of the Government in question, which results in a constant threat to the security and stability of the entire region of southern Africa. Its persistent defiance and disregard of the efforts of the international

community seriously undermines the authority of the Security Council and the credibility of the Organization. It also, unfortunately, compels the oppressed peoples to resort to violence, thereby causing more bloodshed in its own country. These well-established facts should be considered by those that support and are in a position to influence the South African régime.

163. Secondly, the means of achieving self-determination and independence for Namibia have been established by the United Nations and cannot be subjected to pre-conditions. Naturally, the magnitude of the tragedy of that African people and the strong feelings it arouses compel us to seek formulas to speed up the process. To that end, the will to achieve political compromise through negotiation, realism and flexibility should be commended, but it must be clearly established that the liberation of Namibia does not depend on, nor is there any reason for it to be the result of, factors other than those which stem from its recognized status as a Territory under colonial domination.

164. Peru hopes that the illegal occupation of Namibia and the wrongful appropriation of its heritage will come to an end as soon as possible. The continued efforts and actions of the Secretary-General to that end deserve the unswerving support of the international community. There is still time to correct mistakes and injustices of the past. On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the least we can do is ensure for ourselves a little peace of mind through the knowledge that we have made considerable strides towards fulfilling our commitments under the Charter of the United Nations.

165. Mr. BENJELLOUN (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Eighteen years ago the General Assembly decided, in resolution 2145 (XXI), to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and to make the Territory the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

166. Since then, the Namibian question has been the subject of countless resolutions and decisions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the OAU and the United Nations, all demanding the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination and independence.

167. The combined efforts of the international community led to the adoption of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which established the ways whereby the Namibian people should determine its own future through free elections under United Nations supervision and control.

168. The adoption of these resolutions gave rise within the international community to some hope of the elimination of the last bastion of colonialism in Africa and the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to liberty and independence.

169. The unanimity concerning resolution 435 (1978) reflects the will of the international community to promote a peaceful and just solution to the Namibian problem and to put an end to the tense situation which prevails in the region and threatens international peace and security.

170. Six years have elapsed since that time, but South Africa has not loosened its grip on the Namibian people or shown itself in any way inclined to implement the relevant resolutions of the Assembly. Furthermore, South Africa, after having subscribed to the United Nations plan, stepped up its policy of racial division, brutal repression and increasing militarization of Namibia.

171. Its desperate efforts to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibian territory and the exploitation of its natural resources were also reflected by its attempts to install an internal settlement and puppet political institutions and to impose an internal settlement as a substitute for the full independence of the Namibian people.

172. South Africa continues with impunity to imprison, torture and kill those who refuse to submit to the vicious policies of *apartheid*. It is consolidating its policy of militarization outside the Territory and making it a base for acts of subversion and aggression against neighbouring States.

173. Aware of the inevitability and imminence of the victory of the Namibian people, South Africa is continuing its systematic, frenzied plunder of the natural resources of Namibia and trying to fragment the Territory.

174. South Africa's stubbornness in defying the general will, which has been clearly and frequently expressed in the successive resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, makes it essential for all Member States to make concerted, decisive efforts to force South Africa to remove the last obstacles impeding the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). These efforts must be based above all on the thorough and effective application of the arms embargo imposed in 1977 by the Security Council, the cessation of all cooperation likely to strengthen the military, and in particular the nuclear potential of South Africa, and the establishment of a fixed time-frame for the accession of Namibia to independence.

175. Morocco shares the general concern and frustration over the deadlock with regard to the settlement of the Namibian question, caused by South Africa's intransigence and the delaying tactics it employs to put off indefinitely implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Morocco is also aware of the magnitude of the sacrifices made by the fraternal people of Namibia to speed up their independence, preserve the territorial integrity of Namibia and free themselves from the policy of humiliation and racial degradation of the Pretoria régime.

176. My country, which has always condemned the obnoxious policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, repeats that it will continue to give its full support to the heroic struggle of the Namibian people until their legitimate aspirations to sovereignty and independence are realized.

177. I cannot conclude without paying a well-deserved tribute to the steadfast work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is making tireless efforts to protect the rights and interests of the Namibian people. In particular, I pay tribute to its President, whose name will remain closely associated with the long march of the Namibian people to freedom and independence.

178. The PRESIDENT: The voting on the draft resolutions contained in the Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*ibid.*] and on the series of amendments to those draft resolutions, circulated in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25, will take place at a subsequent meeting to be announced in the *Journal*.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

85th PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 4 December 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 18

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Adhami of the Syrian Arab Republic, to present the report of the Committee.

2. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: As Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the Special Committee covering its work during the year 1984. The report, which relates, *inter alia*, to item 18 of the agenda, is submitted in accordance with paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 38/54 of 7 December 1983 on the implementation of the Declaration, by which the Assembly requested the Special Committee

> "to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of . . . resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories that have not yet attained independence and, in particular:
>
> (*a*) To formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism".

3. The complete report of the Special Committee is contained in document A/39/23. An account of the Committee's examination of the situation in the individual Territories on the agenda of the Assembly's current session is set out in chapters IX, X and XII to XXVII. An account of its consideration of the other specific items referred to it in the relevant General Assembly resolutions is set out in chapters I to VIII.

4. In meeting between February and October and holding extensive consultations among members throughout the period, the Committee gave adequate consideration to, and submitted recommendations on, all the items on its agenda.

5. In the course of its work, the Special Committee, bearing in mind in particular the specific request addressed to it by the General Assembly in resolution 38/54, reviewed the implementation of the Declaration, as well as the various United Nations resolutions relating to the remaining Territories. On the basis of the review and in the light of developments, the Committee formulated recommendations for the application of further measures by States, by the competent United Nations organs and by the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, with a view to accelerating the pace of decolonization and facilitating the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the peoples concerned.

6. During the year, the Special Committee once again undertook a study of the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa. In the light of the relevant decisions and resolutions of the Assembly's thirty-eighth session, the Committee also continued its consideration of the military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their domination which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration. Under the terms of the relevant provisions of resolution 38/51, the Committee further examined the progress achieved in the implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations. Regarding all those items just mentioned, the Fourth Committee has endorsed the related recommendations of the Special Committee.

7. As members will have noted from the relevant chapters of the report now before the Assembly, the Special Committee devoted considerable attention during the year to the decolonization of the small Territories and approved a number of concrete recommendations and proposals concerning individual Territories. The Fourth Committee has also approved those recommendations, which I hope will be endorsed fully by the Assembly.

8. In that connection, the Special Committee once again took note with satisfaction of the continuing readiness of administering Powers to receive visiting missions of the Committee. In September this year the Special Committee dispatched a visiting mission to Anguilla at the invitation of the Government of the United Kingdom. It also noted the dispatch by

the Secretary-General in April of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands. It is the firm view of the Committee that these visiting missions constitute an invaluable method of securing first-hand information on the situation prevailing in the Territories concerned as well as on the aspirations of the peoples regarding their future.

9. Within the context of the question of the list of Territories to which the Declaration is applicable, the Committee took up separately an item entitled "Special Committee decision of 24 August 1983 concerning Puerto Rico". In this regard, the Committee, following the hearing of representatives of a number of organizations, took a decision on the item, as set out in chapter I of the report. In that decision, the Special Committee, *inter alia*, reaffirmed "the inalienable right of the peoples to self-determination and independence in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the full applicability of the fundamental principles of that resolution with respect to Puerto Rico" [*see A/39/23, chap. I, para. 72*].

10. As reflected in chapter III of its report, the Special Committee carried out a number of other tasks entrusted to it by the General Assembly in various resolutions, as well as those arising from its own previous decisions, including specific activities relating to the question of the publicity to be given to the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization. During the year the Special Committee held a seminar in Vienna with non-governmental organizations as part of its continuing effort to enlist their support in the dissemination of the relevant information and in the mobilization of world public opinion in the cause of decolonization. The Committee also took part in a number of international conferences and meetings convened by those organizations. It is the Committee's intention, in keeping with related decisions of the Assembly, to continue to hold consultations with the organizations concerned and to participate in conferences, seminars and other special meetings dealing with decolonization arranged by those organizations as well as by the United Nations bodies concerned.

11. With regard to the general aspects of the process of decolonization, I should like, on behalf of the Special Committee, to express the hope that the proposals outlined in section S of chapter I, entitled "Future work", will meet with the Assembly's approval so that the Committee may proceed with the tasks it proposes to undertake.

12. The Special Committee also recommends that the General Assembly renew its appeal to the administering Powers concerned to take immediately all the necessary steps for the implementation of the Declaration and the relevant United Nations resolutions. In that connection, the Committee, in the light of the useful results achieved as a consequence of the active participation in its work of all the administering Powers, recommends that the General Assembly again request the administering Powers concerned to participate actively in its work relating to the Territories under their respective administration.

13. Further, bearing in mind the affirmation by the General Assembly that direct association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies is an effective means of promoting the progress of the peoples in those Territories towards a position of equality with States Members of the United Nations, the Special Committee recommends that the Assembly invite the administering Powers to allow representatives of the Territories concerned to participate in the discussion in the Fourth Committee and in the Special Committee on the items relating to their respective countries.

14. The General Assembly might also wish to renew its appeal to all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to comply with the various requests addressed to them by the United Nations in its resolutions on the question of decolonization.

15. The year 1985 will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. In that connection, the Special Committee has formulated a series of recommendations for consideration by the Assembly, as set out in chapter II of the report now before the Assembly. By adopting the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of that chapter, the Assembly would approve a programme of activities to be undertaken by the United Nations organs concerned and the United Nations system of organizations, Member States, the Secretary-General, the regional inter-governmental bodies and national governmental and non-governmental organizations in observance of the anniversary.

16. In the preparation of the proposed programme the Chairman of the Special Committee, Mr. Koroma, has held exhaustive and extensive consultations throughout the year with all concerned. The arduous work carried out and the positive contributions made by Mr. Koroma are deeply appreciated by all the members of the Special Committee. Indeed, he has accomplished single-handedly—and at an extraordinary saving to the Organization, I might add—what on similar occasions in the past had to be prepared by a special group or committee of Member States especially appointed by the General Assembly to prepare such programmes. I wish to pay a warm personal tribute to Mr. Koroma for carrying out these important tasks on our behalf.

17. The Special Committee recommends that, in approving the programme of work outlined in chapter I and the programme of activities envisaged for 1985, as set out in chapter II, to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration, the General Assembly also make adequate financial provisions to cover all the activities envisaged by the Committee for 1985. Finally, the Committee expresses the hope that the Secretary-General will continue to provide it with all the facilities and personnel necessary for the discharge of its mandate.

Mr. Barma (Chad), Vice-President, took the Chair.

18. On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend the report to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call now on the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. G. Koroma of Sierra Leone.

20. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone), Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: The General Assembly has just heard an

account of the work of the Special Committee during 1984. I shall therefore confine myself to a few observations, as Chairman of the Special Committee, concerning some of the developments during the year in the field of decolonization.

21. At the outset of this year, the former British colony of Brunei became a sovereign independent State, and it is gratifying to note that, having joined the Organization as a full Member at the beginning of the current session, Brunei Darussalam has made an appreciable contribution to the related work of the Assembly.

22. It is indeed a source of deep satisfaction that since the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, 50 former Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, with an aggregate population of over 150 million, have attained independent nationhood. Through their active participation in the work of the United Nations and its system of organizations, they have greatly enhanced the ability of the world body to deal effectively with the many problems which afflict the international community.

23. These past achievements notwithstanding, we must at the same time be keenly conscious of the solemn obligation and responsibility placed upon us under the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration in respect of the remaining colonial Territories, the populations of which have yet to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

24. Of these Territories, our foremost concern is, of course, the grave situation which continues to prevail in Namibia. As I had occasion to elaborate only a few days ago in my statement to the Assembly [*78th meeting*], this ominous threat of a massive escalation of violence in the area exists because South Africa has chosen to defy the world. I wish only to reiterate here that, in light of the continuing defiance by South Africa of its Charter obligations and its persistent use of force to perpetuate its illegal domination of the Territory, the full and effective application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations remains the key by which the United Nations can obtain South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the Security Council.

25. I wish to pay a particular tribute to the Governments of the front-line States for their steadfast support for and commitment to the cause of a free and independent Namibia and their determined efforts towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—the only acceptable basis on which a peaceful transition in the Territory can be achieved. A well-deserved tribute is due also to the leadership of the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], for its continued statesmanship in working out an internationally acceptable solution and guiding Namibia to its long-awaited independence. The Special Committee will, within its own mandate, continue to extend all possible assistance in the achievement of that goal.

26. The other colonial Territories, particularly those in the Caribbean and in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, face entirely different and often highly complex problems, partly because of their small territorial size and population and frequently because of their isolation and limited resources, as pointed out in the relevant conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee. These considerations cannot, however, be allowed to interfere or limit the rights and privileges of the peoples concerned, particularly with regard to their right to make their own decisions in respect of their future. In the discharge of their obligations, the administering Powers concerned must recognize these rights and permit the peoples of those Territories to make their decisions freely and without inducement. To that end, I should like to underscore the responsibility of the administering Powers to intensify programmes of political education of the peoples of the Territories under their administration, in order to deepen their awareness of the purposes and the objectives of the Charter and the Declaration in relation to their future status.

27. In the discharge of their primary responsibility as defined in the Charter, the administering Powers should do their utmost likewise to ensure that the economies of the Territories they administer are placed on a sound basis, and to that end they should organize effective development programmes, enlisting to the maximum extent the assistance available from the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations. That such programmes carefully protect and safeguard the best interests, both present and future, of the peoples of the Territories concerned should be a paramount consideration.

28. Some of these and other important recommendations of the Special Committee, as approved by the Fourth Committee at its 18th meeting a fortnight ago, will shortly be considered by the Assembly, and I wish to express my confident hope that these recommendations will receive the Assembly's positive endorsement.

29. In connection with its consideration of the situation in small Territories, the Committee continues to receive the co-operation of the administering Powers concerned, for which we are grateful. As the General Assembly has repeatedly made clear in this regard, such co-operation enhances the capacity of the Organization, particularly the Special Committee, to assist effectively the peoples of the Territories in the realization of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Charter and the declaration on decolonization.

30. The dispatch in April 1984 of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, of which I had the honour to serve as Chairman, is a case in point. The Mission, invited by the Government of Australia as the administering Power concerned, was able to observe at first hand the act of self-determination by the people of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and verified *in situ* their true wishes and aspirations as regards their future status.

31. The Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power concerned, likewise invited the Special Committee's Visiting Mission to Anguilla in September this year. As noted during the related debate in the Fourth Committee, members are unanimous in the view that these visiting missions constitute the most direct as well as the most effective means of securing information on the social, political and economic conditions prevailing in the colonial Territories and of ascertaining at first hand the real wishes and aspirations of the peoples concerned. It is hoped that the Committee will be able, with the continuing co-operation of the administering Powers, to dispatch such missions as and when appropriate.

32. In relation to those Territories which are the subject either of conflicting claims to sovereignty or of special interest to some Governments by reasons of geographical, historical, or other circumstances, the underlying principles embodied in the Charter and the Declaration continue to apply fully. At the same time, we must at all times be mindful of the need to facilitate the peaceful resolution of divergent claims and interests through negotiations, mutual accommodation and good will.

33. In this context, it is gratifying to note that dialogue continues in respect to Gibraltar towards the normalization of the border problem, as well as the working out of a solution acceptable to all concerned. I am confident that similarly complex issues confronting other Territories will be resolved amicably and expeditiously through negotiation and consultation, given the necessary will and commitment of the Governments concerned. The important role to be played by the Secretary-General in that connection cannot be overemphasized, and we are all grateful to him for his incessant efforts in that regard.

34. The Rapporteur of the Special Committee has already pointed out that the relevant chapters of the Committee's report contain a number of concrete recommendations concerning the various problems existing in the remaining colonial Territories. It is my firm belief and hope that the General Assembly will, while discussing the item, give its most serious attention to the recommendations made by the Special Committee. I am confident that approval by the General Assembly of those and other important recommendations will further enhance the capacity of the Organization to deal effectively with the remaining colonial issues.

35. As will be noted in the report, it has been a longstanding practice in the Special Committee to attempt to arrive at decisions on the various matters of which it is seized by the broadest possible degree of consensus. This method has in the past always served well not only the Special Committee but also the Fourth Committee and has facilitated the Assembly's consideration of the related recommendations of the Special Committee. I am confident that members will continue to do their utmost to avoid contentious and divisive procedures and will thus continue to demonstrate their commitment to the cause of those whose right to self-determination and independence we have been entrusted with the task of ensuring.

36. I should like, in this connection, to pay a particular tribute to Mr. Renagi Lohia, the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, for his singularly outstanding leadership and statesmanship in enabling that Committee to conclude its work in an exemplary manner. His personal dedication to the cause of the peoples concerned is well known, and his contribution to the process of decolonization has been amply demonstrated throughout the session.

37. It is indeed with great pleasure that I note in a communication addressed to the President by Mr. Lohia the expressed readiness and wish of the Government of Papua New Guinea to join the membership of the Special Committee, particularly at a time when the situation affecting the region calls for our closer and intensified examination within the context of resolution 1514 (XV). I wish to assure Mr. Lohia of my unreserved support for and endorsement of the wish of his Government, and I look forward to the opportunity of working closely with him in the Special Committee.

38. I am bound to record that the progress made in decolonization seems only to underline the anomaly that close to 3 million people continue to live under colonial rule and that one third of them live in Namibia under a racist régime which offers little hope of emancipation. It is with this concern in mind that the Special Committee has submitted a suggested programme to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration, as set out in chapter II of its report introduced by the Rapporteur at this meeting. Consultations on particulars of activities to be undertaken in observance of the anniversary at the national, regional and international levels began as early as the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly and have continued throughout the year with Member States, regional intergovernmental bodies, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations and senior officials of the United Nations, non-governmental organizations and liberation movements concerned. The proposed programme incorporates various suggestions and proposals received during those consultations and thus represents a broad consensus of the cross-section of the international community. In respect of some of the activities envisaged there are, admittedly, several members which question the wisdom of incurring the related expenditures. Their concerns—which I share—are genuine and sincere. I wish, however, to appeal to them for their understanding, for, while so much has been accomplished in the field of decolonization in the past, we do have the remaining tasks, which we know we can successfully carry out given the necessary will and dedication of all concerned. The suggested programme is addressed to that end. I sincerely hope that members will agree with me that the worthy objectives to which those activities are dedicated justify the expenditure entailed.

39. Permit me to make a few personal comments at this stage. This year, as in the previous year, I have enjoyed the fullest co-operation and friendship of my colleagues, both in the Committee and in the Secretariat, and I wish to express my sincere appreciation to all of them. My particular thanks go to my friends and colleagues and the other officers of the Committee. It has been an honour and a privilege to work with such dedicated colleagues. To each of them I owe a personal debt of gratitude for their devoted service in the cause of decolonization. My special appreciation goes to the outstanding work accomplished by the Rapporteur, Mr. Adhami. Having served with distinction as Rapporteur during the past four years, Mr. Adhami has become an indispensable institution within the Committee itself and has contributed immeasurably to the resolution of many a complex problem in connection with the work of the Committee. We are also grateful to him for his outstanding political acumen and skill in reformulating the Committee decisions into appropriate proposals for consideration by the General Assembly. We are all aware that his work facilitated the task of the Fourth Committee immensely in this regard. My deep appreciation also goes to Mr. Ammar Amari, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, Mr. Pulz, in his capacity as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance, and Mr. Leslie Rowe, Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories. I am particularly

indebted to Mr. Amari for having undertaken the often long and arduous tasks of holding consultations and negotiations so as to arrive at consensus decisions. To all of them I owe a personal debt of gratitude for their devoted service and for their friendship.

40. The Secretary-General has shown consistent interest in the field of decolonization. We are grateful to him for his interest and for his co-operation and assistance in our work.

41. Having briefly reviewed some of the principal developments in the field of decolonization, and in keeping with long-established practice, I should like, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce draft resolutions A/39/L.17 and Add.1 and A/39/L.18 and Add.1, which have been submitted under this item. As these two draft resolutions reflect both the developments and the problems that I have just outlined, I need not, I am sure, elaborate on their substance. Draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Add.1 deals with general aspects of decolonization, and by it, the Assembly would among other things, renew the mandate of the Special Committee. Draft resolution A/39/L.18 and Add.1 deals with dissemination of information on decolonization, and by it the Assembly would once again underscore the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the aims and purposes of the Declaration. As noted in chapter III of the report of the Special Committee, it was understood that some of the conclusions and recommendations endorsed by the Special Committee would require appropriate consultations in connection with their implementation. Accordingly, it is my intention to hold such consultations in accordance with that understanding and as necessary. Speaking on behalf of the sponsors, I wish to commend these draft proposals to the members of the Assembly for their serious attention and unanimous approval.

42. Mr. RANDHAWA (India): On 21 September this year, the Assembly had the pleasure of welcoming into the United Nations the newest—its 159th—Member of this great family, Brunei Darussalam. The independence of Brunei Darussalam nearly a year ago and its subsequent admission to United Nations membership brought the Organization one step closer to the cherished goal of universality.

43. There can be no doubt that the emergence into independent nationhood in the course of recent decades of a large number of erstwhile colonies has changed not merely the geopolitical configuration of vast regions of our planet but has also had a profound and revolutionary impact on contemporary international relations. In this metamorphosis, the United Nations has played no mean role, particularly in the period after the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960, and following the establishment of the Special Committee.

44. Our debate today assumes special significance in that it takes place on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), an event that happily coincides with another milestone, namely, the fortieth anniversary of the very founding of the United Nations.

45. While we can legitimately derive satisfaction from the impact the Declaration has had over 25 years, let us not allow ourselves to be lulled into the belief that colonialism stands vanquished and that our task is over. Our task is far from over, for the vestiges of colonialism that can manage to survive in this day and age must indeed be deeply rooted and firmly entrenched. Even while the colonial phenomenon progressively diminishes in strength and incidence, forces are at work, particularly in southern Africa, which attempt to stem, if not reverse, the tide of history. The silver jubilee of the declaration on decolonization must therefore be not merely an occasion for celebration; it must serve as an opportunity for us to rededicate ourselves to the objective of decolonization and to face the remaining challenges with fresh vigour and determination.

46. The most important of those challenges, and certainly the most daunting, is the question of Namibia. As my delegation mentioned in its statement on that item last week [*79th meeting*], the failure of the United Nations to bring independence to Namibia, in spite of its very special responsibility over the Territory, is a big blot on the otherwise commendable record of the Organization in the domain of decolonization. My delegation has already had occasion to express its views on the Namibian question. Suffice it for me to underscore here that the racist régime in Pretoria, by virtue of the obnoxious policies it pursues within South Africa itself and its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, in persistent defiance of the universal will, besmirches the effectiveness and credibility of the United Nations.

47. The Palestinian people remain without the national homeland that is their birthright, driven from their soil by foreign forces of occupation and buffeted about in a sea of uncertainty and adversity. We believe that the vexed question of Palestine cannot totally be divorced from the colonial context.

48. The report of the Special Committee gives us the reassurance that continuing efforts are being made to tackle the remaining problems which, though small in number, are complex in nature. The examination of the situation in various Non-Self-Governing Territories undertaken by the Special Committee has helped to identify the particular issues which relate to different Territories and the measures that the administering Powers should take to facilitate the speedy implementation of the declaration on decolonization with regard to those Territories. We believe that no single formula can be universally applied. The people of each Territory must determine the nature of their desired future State and the time frame within which that is to be achieved. It is imperative that the will of the people concerned be freely and fearlessly expressed and that it be respected.

49. The Special Committee has rightly recognized that the people of Non-Self-Governing Territories must be fully informed of options available to them in terms of their future status as part of a larger programme of fostering political awareness and education. It is also incumbent upon the administering authorities, as long as they function in that capacity, to promote the welfare of the local population and to refrain from engaging in such exploitative economic, military or other activities and arrangements which impede the decolonization process. We believe that the presence of military bases and installations on Non-Self-Governing Territories is an impediment to decolonization and, as such, unacceptable. Such bases and installations must be withdrawn from the Territories concerned. Non-Self-Governing Territories must not be used for any military purposes.

50. I should like to pay a tribute to the Special Committee for its tireless and thorough endeavours to monitor closely the situation in the various Non-Self-Governing Territories with a view to protecting and promoting the interests of the peoples of those Territories and guiding them towards self-determination. Under the competent stewardship of Mr. Koroma of Sierra Leone, the Special Committee continues to do commendable work. It has been India's privilege, as a founder member of the Committee, to partake of the joy that comes from colonial Territories of yesteryear emerging into sovereign nationhood. We hope that the day is not far away when the Committee can consider its task accomplished.

51. As I recalled earlier in my statement, next year we will observe a milestone in the life of the declaration on decolonization. My Government attaches great importance to this commemoration and looks forward to participating fully in the activities to be organized on the occasion, just as it has participated in the process of planning for the event. This would only be in keeping with India's profound commitment to the cause of all peoples under the colonial yoke, a commitment that our leaders proclaimed many years before our own independence. It would be in tune with the leading role played by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in championing the cause of decolonization. This would also be in consonance with what our first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, stated: "We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and that the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war."

52. Mr. ESCHEIKH (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The United Nations is now on the eve of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples". Moreover, it now has 159 Members, compared to the 90 it had when this resolution was adopted in 1960.

53. It is a matter of satisfaction for us to point out those facts and thereby to take stock of the progress made on the road to the liberation of peoples from the colonial yoke, as well as the significant contribution made by the Organization in that respect. We are all the more satisfied because we have a rather deep knowledge of the colonial phenomenon, as we were subjected to it for 75 years and engaged in a long and fierce struggle against it, by the most appropriate and varied means.

54. We learned fairly quickly that political independence is not an end in itself. It has meaning only to the extent that it promotes economic, social and cultural development. Hence, colonialism cannot be regarded as having been really abolished until all of its forms are done away with.

55. We make those observations now not only in order to express once again our satisfaction and pride at having made a contribution to the preparation of the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV) and then having participated in its implementation, but also and above all in order to point out that the very spirit of this Declaration and the principles it proclaims derive not from any intellectual exercise but, rather, from bitterly acquired experience.

56. During this second half of the twentieth century, we have seen the liberation of dozens of countries that had lived through these experiences and that, in turn, are contributing to the liberation of human beings and peoples from the colonial yoke of oppression and exploitation.

57. My delegation regards decolonization as one of the major achievements of the United Nations, and we believe that the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has made one of the most important contributions to this process. Tunisia, which is a member of the Special Committee, attaches great importance to its co-operation with the Committee and to the role the Committee has played and continues to play in bringing Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination and independence and in bringing the decolonization process closer to its conclusion. In this regard, the Special Committee's report [*A/39/23*] gives us a clear and accurate picture of the work done in 1984. While paying tribute to the Chairman and members of that Committee for the efforts they have made this year and for the timely proposals the Committee has made, my delegation emphasizes once again the seriousness of the situation, especially in southern Africa.

58. The General Assembly can draw up a clearly favourable balance sheet of the past 24 years, a balance sheet that should give it a feeling of justified pride. But it must note that colonialism and racial discrimination have not, unfortunately, been totally eradicated. The hideous ghost of *apartheid* and colonialism continues to haunt South Africa and Namibia. Stubborn colonialism and the effective domination by a white minority which constantly buttresses its hateful policy of *apartheid* are pitted against the inevitable emancipation of Namibia and South Africa. Instead of complying with the international community's decisions applying the sacred principles of the right of peoples to self-determination, the racist Pretoria régime has been constantly strengthening its military presence in Namibia and using that country as a base for launching devastating incursions into neighbouring countries for the purpose of subjugating them to its own will, thereby openly threatening peace and stability in the region. Moreover, it continues its all-out exploitation of the natural economic resources of the country, which benefit the indigenous population not at all, or very little. Worse still, it persists in applying the classic repressive colonial procedures of the past—that is, to cause one faction of the population of a country to subjugate another. Compulsory and forced recruitment of Namibians, who are incorporated into units that have no purpose other than fighting their own brothers in SWAPO, is a perfect example of this.

59. Those are the reactions of the racist Pretoria régime to the solutions envisaged by the international community for years now. The wisdom and patience of the Organization are met with defiance, arrogance and delaying tactics. These tactics no longer fool anyone. Indeed, at one time there was a glimmer of hope that these tactics might serve the cause of the truly peaceful solutions to which the Organization remains attached above all else. Today, however, they are significant only because they must be forestalled.

60. It is both regrettable and disturbing that some countries in the Organization, including those that have the greatest influence on the racist Pretoria régime and that have loudly and clearly condemned

apartheid and colonialism, continue—under the pretext of seeking openings and dialogue—to be so accommodating to that régime that one can no longer place any credibility in their political will to see the Organization's resolutions implemented. It is that attitude which, in fact, has encouraged Pretoria to stand in constant defiance of the Organization and to use the contact group for clearly diversionary purposes.

61. We therefore take this opportunity to appeal to those countries and to the contact group, which assumed a major responsibility for the preparation and adoption of the settlement plan, to exert the pressure necessary to induce the South African Government to comply with the provisions of the Organization's resolutions.

62. My delegation has had repeated opportunities to express its point of view on this question. It has done so again during this session through the voice of its Minister for Foreign Affairs [*15th meeting*]. Tunisia confirms its support of United Nations efforts to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which remains the cornerstone of any just and lasting solution to this question and the only valid context in which to view a solution that is in conformity with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

63. Tunisia reaffirms its unflagging moral and material support for all those struggling to free themselves from the colonial yoke and from oppression of all kinds. It wishes to express its solidarity to the fraternal Namibian people, under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, as well as to the African National Congress of South Africa and the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania, in their struggle to establish a multiracial democratic society.

64. The commemoration next year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV) will be the appropriate occasion for taking stock of the progress achieved during the past twenty-five years in the implementation of the Declaration, appraising the role played by the United Nations and the bodies connected with it, evolving measures aimed specifically at the elimination of the remaining vestiges of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, and increasing the efforts of the international community to ensure that the peoples still under colonial domination may rapidly achieve freedom and independence.

65. Chapter II of the report of the Special Committee contains the programme of activities to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration. This programme envisages activities at the international, regional and national levels. Convinced that the celebration of this anniversary is a special event that must be marked in an appropriate fashion, my delegation firmly supports the programme of activities. The fact that the process of decolonization is on the verge of completion is a source of satisfaction for us all and deserves to be celebrated appropriately by the Organization.

66. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic): The problems relating to the final implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples continue to occupy an important place in the debates of the General Assembly, because they involve the attainment of a basic objective of the United Nations.

67. Next year we shall commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the historic resolution 1514 (XV), which was submitted to the Assembly by the USSR. Today, the United Nations has 159 Member States. This is convincing evidence of the value and effectiveness of the Declaration. Yet there is no denying the fact that close to 3 million people are still forced to live under colonial oppression. For the United Nations there is an imperative need to make every effort to ensure that the last vestiges of that anachronism of our time are eliminated. A great measure of responsibility for the completion of this urgent task falls on the Member States, because the questions of decolonization are closely linked to the striving for international peace and security. Peace and genuine freedom are indivisible.

68. In the present international situation this connection becomes more obvious than ever when it is a matter of fighting for the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, against neo-colonialism and for independence, peace and the ending of the arms race. The most aggressive forces of imperialism have stepped up the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, to an unparalleled extent. They intensify their drive for military, political and economic expansion and declare large areas of our globe their spheres of vital interest. Existing military bases are being extended or modernized and new ones are being set up on foreign territory, *inter alia*, by using relationships of colonial dependence.

69. Peace cannot reign where the legitimate rights and interests of a people, large or small, are trampled upon. Examples are the use of force against the peoples of Grenada, Nicaragua and El Salvador, the continuing manifestations of imperialist military power in the Middle East, the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. Such cases of resort to gunboat policies undermine the system of relations, cement existing colonial or create neo-colonial dependence and oppression.

70. The German Democratic Republic follows with concern the continued expansion of the system of imperialist bases in almost all dependencies. Those bases are increasingly used for the deployment or testing of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear devices, and they constitute a threat to the regions concerned and to world peace in general. Let me refer in this context to the facts set out in the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*A/39/23*], especially as far as the Pacific Islands, Guam, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands and St. Helena are concerned. My country supports consideration of this important aspect of decolonization by the United Nations and calls upon the responsible Powers to give effect at last to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and thus to respond to the will of the overwhelming majority of Member States.

71. Likewise, we join in the demand of the Special Committee that all military bases be dismantled and all military activities stopped in colonially dependent Territories.

72. The situation in southern Africa makes it as dangerous a hotbed of tension as ever. Despite the decisions of the Security Council, the South African racist régime continues its illegal occupation of

Namibia. The German Democratic Republic emphatically condemns the imperialist policy, which, in disregard of world-wide protests and United Nations decisions, is now as before aimed at keeping alive the régime of *apartheid*—that threat to peace—as an instrument for destabilizing the region and opposing social progress. It advocates that Namibia be granted independence without delay in conformity with the entire range of relevant United Nations decisions, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The solidarity with the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, and the support for its struggle contribute to the liquidation of a dangerous hotbed of tension and thus to the maintenance and strengthening of world peace.

73. The German Democratic Republic will maintain its active solidarity, as was underlined only a few days ago at the ninth session of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

74. Developments in Micronesia show that, apart from the solution of the question of Namibia, there is another topical question of decolonization. The protests of the world public against the manoeuvres by the administering Power aimed at the destruction of the territorial unity of the Trust Territory and at its annexation are constantly growing. They show that the peoples cannot be deceived and that they recognize that the so-called free association status imposed upon parts of the Territory is nothing but the safeguarding of the military, strategic, political and economic interests of the administering Power and has nothing whatsoever to do with the implementation of the Micronesian people's right to self-determination. The transformation of the Pacific Islands into a United States military concentration area gives rise to great concern. If the existing plans are implemented—that is, the conversion of Micronesia into a deployment zone and testing area for nuclear weapons—it will constitute another serious danger to the security of all peoples.

75. The growing militarization is connected with attempts to deprive the United Nations of its right to consider and decide on specific problems of decolonization. This is obvious not only in the case of Micronesia but also with regard to Puerto Rico. However, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is indivisible; it applies to all peoples still under colonial oppression, whether in Namibia, in Micronesia, in Puerto Rico or elsewhere.

76. The German Democratic Republic will in the future also support all United Nations measures aimed at the full implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). There is no reason whatsoever to deny the still dependent peoples their right to self-determination and independence. My delegation expresses its expectation that, especially in connection with the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration and with a view to the full implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, further decisive progress will be made towards the final elimination of the vestiges of colonialism.

77. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In recent decades the world system of colonialism has been dealt a number of crushing blows. On the ruins of colonial possessions there have arisen dozens of new sovereign States which have embarked upon the course of independent development, become Members of the United Nations and played an active part in the solution of pressing international problems. This confirms the prediction made many decades ago by the founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, concerning the historical role of the peoples of the colonies, which, having liberated themselves from the colonial yoke, would participate actively in deciding the fate of the world.

78. The United Nations, which was born as a result of the great triumph of peace-loving peoples over fascism, has made a weighty contribution to the cause of the liberation of the oppressed peoples of the colonies. The most important event in that regard was the adoption, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which solemnly proclaimed the "necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

79. That Declaration, the twenty-fifth anniversary of which will occur next year, and the decisions of the United Nations taken pursuant to it set forth the demand for the elimination of all colonial régimes, proclaimed the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples of the colonies for their national liberation and called upon all States to give them material and moral support in their struggle. The declaration on decolonization has played and will continue in future to play an important role in helping peoples still under colonial rule in their struggle for freedom and independence and also in mobilizing world public opinion in favour of working towards the complete elimination of colonialism.

80. However, notwithstanding the considerable progress of the national liberation movements throughout the world, colonialism has not been completely eliminated. It is still alive. It is actively defending itself and even from time to time goes on the offensive in order to regain lost positions. Colonialism, racism and *apartheid* continue to poison the international atmosphere, constitute a dangerous source of tension and conflict and threaten international peace and security.

81. The people of Namibia continue to languish under the colonial, racist yoke of oppression. Disregarding repeated decisions of the United Nations, the Pretoria régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia. It is exploiting the natural and human resources of that Territory and trying to destroy the national liberation movement of the Namibian people, under the guidance of their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO. For many years Pretoria, with the connivance of the United States and other Western countries, has blocked the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to Namibia and has tried to solve the Namibian problem on a neo-colonialist basis in order to convert Namibia into one of a sort of constellation of African countries all dependent on it, with which South Africa would like to surround itself.

82. There is also cause for serious concern about the intolerable position being created in connection with the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia), which the United States is in the process of annexing in order to turn it for ever

into a military and strategic beach-head and colonial appendage. The United States has been imposing on the people of individual parts of the Trust Territory of Micronesia long-term military agreements whereby the Pentagon can maintain and expand on the islands missile testing ranges, naval bases, strategic air bases and other military facilities, and also so that it can build up stockpiles of nuclear and chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. These actions mean that the United States is riding roughshod over the basic purpose of the trusteeship system, which according to the Charter of the United Nations is the strengthening of international peace and security, and its actions constitute a serious threat to the security not only of the people of Micronesia but of the countries of the region. The danger hanging over Micronesia that it may be absorbed by the United States calls for active intervention by the United Nations in defence of the Micronesian people and their right to genuine self-determination and independence.

83. Other Non-Self-Governing Territories scattered over the world's oceans and adjacent areas are still in a state of colonial dependence. The administering Powers not only are failing to transfer power to the peoples of those Territories but in a number of cases are trying to perpetuate their rule over them, asserting that the peoples of the Territories do not wish to put an end to their colonial status.

84. In a vain attempt to mask the modern forms of colonialism, the United States and the other colonial Powers claim that colonialism no longer exists except in Namibia, that the question of decolonization has been concluded and that there is nothing to discuss in this regard in the United Nations. They depict the national liberation movements as groups of terrorists, and they are trying to present the problem of decolonization as a question of East-West confrontation. In so doing, they slander the policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

85. All this colonialist propaganda is designed to establish a pretext for continuing colonial exploitation of other peoples by the United States and its allies, particularly South Africa. It is designed to suppress by military means the national liberation movements, as is now happening in Namibia and other places. It is designed also to support the racists in southern Africa and to impose their hegemony upon the peoples of Africa, Latin America and other continents.

86. The fact is that today the problem of decolonization is primarily a conflict between South Africa, the United States and certain other Western Powers on the one hand and the peoples of Africa, Latin America, Asia and the Pacific Ocean basin on the other. It is a conflict between the national liberation movements in Africa and other regions, which rely on the support of all progressive forces, on the one hand, and the combined forces of imperialism, colonialism and racism on the other.

87. Everywhere in the colonial and other dependent Territories, we see continued plunder by those in foreign economic, financial and other circles and by Western transnational corporations, which are exploiting the human and natural resources of these Territories. United Nations decisions have affirmed that these activities by foreign monopolies in colonial Territories constitute one of the principal obstacles to the prompt and full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

88. The imperialist States are solely to blame for the consequences of the exploitation of the human and natural resources of colonial Territories in the past and for the continuing neo-colonialist plunder of such Territories today. It is entirely justifiable and correct to demand that those to blame for the dire plight of the peoples of former and present colonial Territories and countries should pay compensation for the damage they have done to the economic and social development of those countries.

89. There is cause for particular concern in the military activities of the colonial Powers in Trust and other dependent Territories and in their clear desire to make use of those Territories for their global strategic purposes, contrary to the cause of strengthening international peace and security. The military bases of the colonial Powers and their military activity in dependent Territories—whether it be Namibia, Micronesia, Puerto Rico, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, Diego Garcia, the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands or anywhere else—are in no way intended to increase employment among the local populations, as the colonial Powers frequently claim, but are used above all for their direct military purpose, to suppress the national liberation movements of the peoples and to interfere in the internal affairs of independent States. We do not have to look far for examples of this. It is well known that the huge United States military air base that occupies one third of the territory of the island of Guam was used by the Pentagon to wage the United States war of aggression against Viet Nam.

90. During the Special Committee's annual consideration of the question of Puerto Rico, it was pointed out that that island had been turned into a military beach-head for the dispatch of United States rapid deployment forces to any part of Central or South America. Puerto Rico was used by the United States for its armed aggression against the sovereign State of Grenada in order to restore colonialism to that island.

91. The war waged by the United Kingdom to restore the colonial status of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands showed how dangerous it is for the cause of peace that there should continue to be any colonial possessions, however small. The colonial Powers are trying to hold on to those possessions, even if it means waging large-scale colonial wars. It is therefore easy to understand the concern of the Latin American countries at the measures taken by the United Kingdom to militarize the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands still further.

92. Another example of that same policy motivated by the military and strategic desires of imperialism is the retention in colonial status and the conversion into a military base by the United States of the Indian Ocean island of Diego Garcia.

93. Recently the international community has witnessed increased efforts by the forces of imperialism and racism—primarily the United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*]—to undermine the unity and solidarity of the African countries and to declare Africa, particularly southern Africa, a sphere of their "vital interests" and to draw the peoples of Africa into their

imperialist strategy of global political and military confrontation.

94. The United States and South Africa have been trying to impose their will on the peoples of southern Africa using the carrot-and-stick method, gambling on the desire of the African peoples to live in peace and stability. Knowing full well that African unity is a political weapon for Africa in its struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, South Africa, the United States, certain other Western countries and Israel have been trying to disrupt that unity and to split the African countries into opposing groups, thereby diverting the attention of the African peoples from the solution of the pressing national problems of the day and from their common struggle in favour of peace and against the danger of nuclear war.

95. That imperialist policy of the Western Powers, which is designed to split the African countries, is clearly seen here at the United Nations as well, where at this very moment, at this session of the General Assembly, they are working hard to block the implementation of decisions of the Group of African States and to amend draft resolutions with a direct impact on the interests of African and other non-aligned States.

96. The Soviet delegation is convinced that it is important for the success of the struggle against racism and colonialism that there should be purposeful, single-minded and united action by African and other non-aligned countries and all others which advocate the liberation of the oppressed peoples. We have no doubt that all countries that advocate the elimination of colonialism will resolutely refute the Western countries' policy of curtailing the anti-colonial activities of the United Nations and diminishing the role of the United Nations bodies working in the field of decolonization.

97. In considering the important and acute problem of the fight against colonialism, we must pay a special tribute to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That Committee has been carefully following the world situation and making very appropriate recommendations, and its decisions must be fully supported by the General Assembly.

98. It is the duty of the United Nations to secure the most prompt and complete implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. The Organization must ensure that colonialism, racism and *apartheid* are completely and definitively eliminated. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples must give a new impetus to the efforts of the United Nations and the entire international community in the struggle for the prompt completion of the decolonization process. The Soviet delegation supports the programme adopted by the Special Committee in connection with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration.

99. It is time to put an end to the colonialists' disregard of the decisions of the United Nations concerning the granting of independence to Namibia and other dependent Territories. In this connection, the Soviet Union supports the demand of the African countries that the Security Council adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, against the Pretoria régime. To achieve that it is necessary to overcome the resistance of the United States and other Western Powers permanent members of the Security Council which have been impeding the adoption of effective, comprehensive international sanctions against South Africa.

100. On the basis of its position of principle, the Soviet Union has been providing and will continue to provide comprehensive assistance and support to the peoples still living in colonial slavery in their struggle for freedom, independence and the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

101. Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) (*interpretation from French*): Next year we shall be celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960. On that happy occasion we shall be celebrating an event that has pride of place among the most important achievements of the United Nations.

102. Since then, millions of men, women and children have been freed from domination imposed upon them by colonial Powers in close collaboration with imperialist circles and their exploiting monopolies. A certain number of States have assumed their place within the great family of nations, and these former victims of the colonial yoke have now, hand in hand with other independent and sovereign States, made their sincere contribution to the acceleration of the process of decolonization, which assumed great impetus after the adoption of the Declaration.

103. Unfortunately, it is sad to observe that there continue to be on our planet peoples that are deprived of the right to enjoy the relevant provisions of the Declaration and who suffer the adverse and deleterious consequences of the most inhuman system of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

104. Namibia is the cruellest example of colonialism mankind has known throughout the whole of its history of bloody struggle against foreign domination. The Territory of Namibia, which continues to be illegally occupied, still does not know the shining sun of independence simply because the racist régime of South Africa and its imperialist protectors do not wish to renounce their selfish interests in exploiting and pillaging the richest resources of the world—those in Namibia—which should be used in the interest of its oppressed people in an independent and sovereign country free from any kind of foreign exploitation and domination.

105. Benefiting from the full support of the imperialist circles, the racist régime of South Africa is using all possible means to prolong its armed occupation of Namibia for the purpose of satisfying the economic interests of transnational companies that have their headquarters in South Africa and in some of the Western and other countries and are exploiting and pillaging the natural and human resources of Namibia. Elsewhere, the Pretoria régime is playing an important role in safeguarding the so-called vital interests of the United States and its allies in this part of the world. Evidence of this abounds, and several delegations have referred to it during the general debate on the question of Namibia during the last few days in this very Hall.

106. That is why the régime of occupation and its imperialist protectors find it difficult to abandon their inhuman policy *vis-à-vis* the oppressed peoples of Namibia and South Africa. Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, in his message on 27 August, on the occasion of Namibia Day, addressed to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar expressed the position of principle of my Government as follows:

> "The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan condemns the infamous collaboration of imperialist circles with the *apartheid* régime in their brutal activities against the heroic people of Namibia. We are convinced that final victory will surely belong to the Namibian people, guided by its vanguard, SWAPO.
>
> "While restating their brotherly solidarity and their wide-ranging support for the just and noble struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence, the people and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are convinced that strict compliance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations will contribute to a just and peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem."

107. Another critical situation the Assembly must deal with seriously prevails in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which the United States was mandated to prepare for the free exercise of the right to self-determination and independence and to assure its legitimate defence, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement signed between the United Nations and the United States Government in its capacity as the administering Power.

108. Unfortunately, the course of events has been manoeuvred in a direction opposite to that which had been defined in the pertinent provisions of the Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The administering Power, instead of taking into consideration what had been entrusted to it by the Organization, has attempted by all possible means deriving from the policies of colonialist and imperialist Powers to annex the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The strengthening of its economic dependence, the imposition of American culture under the pretext of political education—specifically with respect to the younger generation, in order to prevent the organization of a political and economic struggle against the colonialist and imperialist practices—the evacuation of the population from their own land in order to conduct tests of various types of arms, including nuclear weapons, and lastly, the turning of this Territory into a military fortress going well beyond the needs of legitimate national defence—all that is typical of the situation in this Territory since it has come under the administration of the United States.

109. As in the past, my delegation condemns the expansionist, aggressive policies of United States imperialism, which is a serious threat to the peace and security of the Pacific region and of the world as a whole. Similarly, we reject the attempts of the United States to remove trusteeship of this Territory from the United Nations, and we appeal to the international community to act in a decisive fashion before it is too late.

110. The Assembly must not limit itself to examining the situation in the Territories to which I have just referred. It has another primary responsibility with respect to the peoples that are victims of the colonialist and imperialist policies of the United States and of other imperialist circles in Puerto Rico and in the so-called small Territories to which the Declaration fully applies. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration is thoroughly examining the various aspects of the situation in each Territory, taking into account its specific circumstances.

111. As for Puerto Rico, after examining the question the Special Committee each year adopts resolutions calling for respect for the right of its people to self-determination and independence. But the United States, in defying the will and aspirations of the Puerto Rican people, not only persists in dominating the Territory by economic, military and political means, but also involves it in military activities against the liberation movements and the countries that have chosen an independent course of political, economic and social development. The aggressive and expansionist policies of the United States Administration with respect to this Territory in the Caribbean must be condemned by us all.

112. The fact that the Declaration remains unimplemented in certain colonial Territories is not because of a lack of will by the peoples still under colonial domination, nor can it be ascribed to the resolutions and decisions strengthening the appropriate ways for its implementation. Rather, it is the efforts of the colonial Powers and their imperialist financial monopolies which, through wide-ranging co-operation, are creating obstacles in the way of the Declaration's implementation.

113. Bases and installations are still maintained and activities of a military character continue in colonial Territories, despite the many resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and its subsidiary organs. In our opinion, they constitute a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration. Recently, the General Assembly, in resolution 38/54, adopted on 7 December 1983, made the following unambiguous appeal. In paragraph 10 it: "Calls upon the colonial Powers to withdraw immediately and unconditionally their military bases and installations from colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones". It is appropriate to ask the colonial Powers once again to comply with the will of the international community.

114. As for the activities of foreign economic and other interests, my delegation believes that they threaten the development of the national economies of the colonial Territories because they strengthen the dependence of those economies on foreign investment and therefore deprive the colonial peoples of the necessary ability to lead their countries once they gain independence.

115. In conclusion, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, as a member of the Special Committee and in conformity with its basic principles and article 14 of the provisional Constitution of the country, which stipulates:

> "The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan supports the struggle of various nations and peoples of the world for peace, national and social freedom,

> democracy and progress, against colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism and against zionism, racism, fascism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*",*

will continue to support the heroic struggle of the colonial peoples for national liberation and will make its sincere contribution to speeding up the decolonization process.

116. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam): The triumph of the anti-fascist forces in the Second World War was a telling blow to international imperialism because it brought about recognition of the principle of the equal rights and right to self-determination of peoples, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. By the same token, it was a strong encouragement to peoples still under colonial domination. Since that historic victory we have witnessed extensive and unprecedented steps in the development of national liberation movements in the world. The peoples in various countries, from Asia and the Pacific to Africa, from the Middle East to Latin America and the Caribbean, strengthened by the awakening of millions of people refusing to live in slavery, oppression and exploitation, rose up vigorously and shattered colonialist and imperialist domination and then advanced along the road of national independence and social progress.

117. At a time when the Second World War was drawing to an end, the Vietnamese people stood up and seized power from the militarists. They founded an independent, unified State on 2 September 1945. But again the colonialists dispatched expeditionary troops to attack Viet Nam; the Vietnamese people were compelled to wage a nine-year war of resistance against the aggressors, a war which was brought to an end with the Dien Bien Phu victory in July 1954. That victory was a telling blow to old-type colonialism, and through it the Vietnamese people had the honour of making a worthy contribution to the common victories of colonial peoples and countries in the cause of national liberation and the process of decolonization.

118. A few months ago, our people jubilantly celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the Dien Bien Phu victory, and now we are going joyfully to join all other nations in observing, this coming year, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

119. Great changes in the international arena as a result of uprisings, with their attendant sacrifice and hardship, by the oppressed peoples from the Second World War to the 1950s in fact contributed significantly to the emergence of the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. Before the Declaration the history of decolonization was marked by significant international events such as the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indo-China, following the Dien Bien Phu victory with solemn international recognition of the fundamental national rights of the Vietnamese people, and the 1955 Asian-African Conference at Bandung, with the participation of 27 Asian and African States, demanding freedom and liberation for all oppressed peoples.

120. It is of great significance that the Soviet Union, the glorious cradle of the Great October Revolution, a widespread revolution that blazed the way for social and national liberation, was responsible for the initiative on decolonization put before the General Assembly, which was finalized and adopted at the fifteenth session and entitled "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples". The Declaration fully reflects the great changes I have mentioned. It therefore has extensive theoretical content as well as practical significance.

121. The most outstanding points that the Declaration confirms are the following.

122. First, it confirms the inevitable victory of the struggle of the oppressed peoples for liberation in this era as an inevitable and irreversible process. The mighty strength that guarantees victory stems from the peoples' consciousness of their decisive role in the struggle; hence their determination to take control of their own destinies with all the ways and means they have, with the vigorous sympathy and encouragement of the international community.

123. Secondly, it highlights the main objectives and content of the struggle for the right to self-determination at the present time. Generally speaking, it confirms, first of all, the fundamental national rights—that is to say, the right to independence, sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity—which each people has achieved. In new circumstances, it is the assurance of the right of all peoples to choose in freedom their political system and ways of independent development in the economic, social and cultural fields and to fulfil their aspirations to social progress and advancement towards socialism. In emphasizing the need to eradicate all forms and manifestations of neo-colonialism, the Declaration specifies concrete objectives of action. It marks a new stage in the struggle for national liberation and the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, as well as for the complete elimination of all oppression and exploitation by neo-colonialists.

124. Looking back at the process of decolonization since the year of the adoption of the Declaration, we find that nearly 70 countries have gained political independence and become Members of the United Nations. Hundreds of millions of people have rid themselves of the colonial yoke and are now playing a very important role in international life. Though the old colonialism is coming to an end, it still remains tenacious and continues its cruel repression in small Trust Territories and colonies, mainly in southern Africa, and sporadically in some other parts of the world.

125. For many years, although the General Assembly has adopted many resolutions and decisions aimed at speeding up the implementation of the Declaration, the situation in a number of Trust and colonial Territories remains deplorable and unacceptable. It is an undeniable and arrogant challenge to the international community, United Nations resolutions, morality and international law that the Namibian people are still facing insurmountable obstacles on the road to independence, even though the United Nations has had direct responsibility for this Territory since 1966. The racist régime of South Africa, which has been given financial, political, diplomatic and military support and assistance by the United States and a number of other NATO States, is doing its utmost to cling to this area of strategic importance. Most States in the world have rejected as completely absurd and groundless the

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

linkage theory put forward as a pretext to delay the granting of independence to the Namibian people.

126. With complete disregard of the Puerto Rican people's aspirations and the relevant decisions of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the United States Administration continues to impede the exercise of its right to self-determination by the Puerto Rican people. It has expanded its military bases and installations, which constitute a threat to the sovereignty and security of the countries in the Central American and Caribbean region and to international peace and security.

127. In regard to the small Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Pacific, it is unacceptable that Micronesia, after 37 years under the trusteeship of the United States, has been divided into four neo-colonies and gradually annexed by the administering Power under the cloaks of referendums, plebiscites, the Compact of Free Association and the Federated Union of Micronesia.

128. These are just a few examples that show how difficult are the struggles for self-determination of the peoples still under colonial and imperialist domination. They also indicate the major obstacles that the Special Committee often faces in its continued efforts to support those struggles.

129. This year the Special Committee has made new efforts and submitted a number of conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly. Although the content of some relevant documents insufficiently reflect realities concerning the Trust Territories, they are of great help in the encouragement of public opinion and in the struggle to accomplish the noble mission enshrined in the Declaration.

130. The struggle to oppose neo-colonialism is a complicated one, for neo-colonialism is a grave danger to the independence, sovereignty and free development of all countries. Since the colonialist and imperialist Powers are unable to maintain the old type of colonial domination, they have sought by all possible means to safeguard their interests, domination and exploitation by new methods and manoeuvres. They have resorted to all forms of carefully disguised repression and exploitation. The struggle against neo-colonialism, therefore, is becoming the focal point of the endeavour of the developing countries to maintain their right to live in freedom and equality, their economic liberation and independent development. It is indeed an arduous and complex struggle, as the experience of many countries has shown.

131. Taking advantage of the dependent situation and economic difficulties experienced by former colonial countries that have just gained political independence, the colonialist and imperialist Powers are trying to keep or draw the former within their orbit and to oppose the demand for the establishment of a new, just and equitable international economic order based on relations of equality and mutual interest.

132. In fact, the international political and economic relations of recent years have exposed the great danger of neo-colonialism. Apart from the threat or use of force against those countries that pursue the policy of social progress and independence, the colonial and imperialist Powers have resorted to economic blockades and sanctions, economic and political pressure and injustice and inequality in trade, as well as in international monetary systems and financial relations. We are not surprised to hear in this forum strong criticism of financial colonialism, that burden on developing countries. It is true that the concerted activities of international banking and financial centres and transnational corporations constitute a new type of collective colonialism that is dangerous to all peoples.

133. Next year, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration will be commemorated. At the same time, the Vietnamese people will commemorate the tenth anniversary of the liberation of South Viet Nam and the reunification of our beloved motherland. In the spirit of Dien Bien Phu, we mobilized our forces nationwide and defeated the attempt to occupy South Viet Nam and to turn it into a neo-colony. Once again, history gave us an opportunity to have the honour of striking a deadly blow at a bastion of neo-colonialism. That victory constituted a contribution by our people to the common struggle of nations for the eradication of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. With sincere gratitude, we attribute our victory to the sympathy and support of progressive peoples throughout the world, including the American people.

134. This situation is not the result of a mere coincidence. It reflects, to some extent, the close relationship between nations in the complex struggle for the strict implementation of the historic Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples the world over. That is why the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam once again reaffirms its constant solidarity with and support for the just cause of the independence, freedom and authentic self-determination of all peoples.

135. We strongly reaffirm our sympathy with and complete support for the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic and legitimate representative, in their struggle for independence, sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, having recognized and established diplomatic relations with the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, fully supports the struggle of the Saharan people, under the leadership of the POLISARIO Front,[1] for the exercise of self-determination and national independence, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and of the General Assembly. We support the struggle of the Puerto Rican people for self-determination and independence, on the basis of the fundamental principles of the Declaration. We support the right to self-determination of the people of East Timor. We extend our militant solidarity to the remaining colonial Territories in their struggle for independence.

136. History evolves in accordance with objective laws, and it cannot be hindered. The foundation of colonialism has been shaken since 1917, when the colonial countries and peoples were awakened by the October revolution. National liberation movements since the Second World War have tolled the knell of colonialism and are striking heavy blows at neo-colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. As a matter of fact, the more defeats they suffer, the more closely the imperialists, colonialists, racists and international reactionaries collude with each other and the more cunning and brazen manoeuvres they use.

137. The Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV) "solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations". It indicates the common aspirations of all nations to independence and freedom. We believe that all obstacles to the process of decolonization will be eliminated. The peoples in colonial and dependent Territories will certainly gain their independence and play valuable roles in the United Nations.

138. Mr. CÉSAR (Czechoslovakia): Decolonization is an important achievement of nations, constituting a breakthrough in the history of whole continents and contributing to a qualitative change in the character of current international relations. Most oppressed colonial peoples, often facing strong opposition and cruel repression on the part of colonialists, have succeeded in asserting their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Their endeavours have resulted in giving concrete form to the ideals pronounced for the first time in the very first documents of the revolutionary Soviet Government.

139. The United Nations could not remain indifferent to the struggle for the elimination of colonialism and fail to support the liberation efforts of the colonial peoples. A milestone in these efforts was the adoption, as a result of a Soviet initiative, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Declaration has become a new stimulus to and, at the same time, an irreplaceable guideline in the intensified anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle of the progressive forces of the world for the freedom and independence of colonial peoples. We consider the fact that the impact of the Declaration and the concrete conclusions of the Organization have helped dozens of States attain independence and self-determination to be one of the most important results achieved by the United Nations.

140. In spite of these indisputable successes in the anti-colonialist struggle, the elimination of all forms and practices of colonialism has not yet been completed. The deliberations of the General Assembly on the colonial situation in Namibia, which have just concluded, highlighted once again all aspects of the cruel colonial oppression of the Namibian people perpetrated by the racist régime of South Africa, with the support and assistance of the United States and a number of other imperialist States. Also, the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee have analysed those still outstanding colonial issues on the agenda of the United Nations. The conclusions adopted in respect of the developments in Micronesia, in Puerto Rico, in the Malvinas Islands, in Western Sahara, in Guam, in the British colonies in the Caribbean and in other colonial Territories whose situation has been discussed stress the grave nature of the persisting colonial practices. They prove that the declaration on decolonization is still a living and topical document and emphasize the imperative and urgent necessity of completing the process of decolonization.

141. Yet, full implementation of the declaration on decolonization is still opposed by the colonialist Powers and their allies, which strive to maintain their military and political influence in those parts of the world controlled from the colonies, misusing their geographic positions for their own military-strategic purposes. With direct participation of Western monopolies, they profit from the exploitation of the natural and mineral resources of a number of colonies—as well as of their human potential—failing in a number of respects to fulfil the obligation to provide for the political, economic and social development of the populations of colonial countries that is clearly stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations and highlighted in a number of conclusions the Organization has adopted on decolonization.

142. The result is an alarming social situation in many of the remaining colonies—lack of economic self-sufficiency, vulnerability and insufficient viability. The exploitation of colonies and the misuse of colonial rule for military purposes by the colonial imperialist Powers have nothing in common with the interests of colonial peoples, with their economic, social, political and cultural advancement. Such practices violate the obligations of colonial Powers as embodied in the Charter; they block decolonization and, moreover, pose a threat to international peace and security and cause a deterioration of the world's situation.

143. What is the response of the colonial Powers to the conclusions of the United Nations, to the calls of the international community for the completion of decolonization and to the justified desires of colonial peoples? What are the arguments used to justify the protraction of colonial rule?

144. Efforts to put off the decolonization of the remaining colonies are in many cases combined with attempts to annex Territories and impose upon them neo-colonial models of political and economic dependence. Moreover, there have been tendencies to downplay outstanding decolonization issues. As we witnessed this year again, while the colonial Powers speak of their so-called proud decolonization record, they are carrying out such practices. They pronounce themselves against resolute means in the struggle for self-determination and independence, ignoring the fact that a number of former colonial countries now Members of the United Nations were forced to seek their independence through armed struggle. They speak of some responsibility of the authorities established in the colonial countries during the era of colonial rule for the development of those countries, thus denying the existence of the obligation incumbent upon them in the Charter to create conditions for the self-determination and independence of colonial countries, including appropriate economic infrastructures.

145. In spite of the fact that they themselves have kept the colonial peoples in bondage and backwardness for centuries, in some cases they now put forward arguments about the low level of the development of peoples as a reason for "specific approaches" to, and postponements of, the accession of those peoples to independence. They try to justify their military presence in the colonies by describing it as a measure designed to safeguard the security of those Territories. They try to place decolonization in the context of the so-called East-West confrontation, with the usual anti-communist rhetoric. In our opinion, any such approach to questions governed by the Charter, other norms of international law, the declaration on decolonization and many other conclusions of the Organization are unacceptable and insincere.

146. The way to the realization of the imperative of self-determination for all colonial peoples lies in the colonial Powers consistently complying with their

obligations, under the supervision of the international community. It is also necessary to intensify all-round support for the national liberation movements and to recognize the legitimacy of their struggle for self-determination, even when this includes armed struggle. Full implementation of the ideals of decolonization is also promoted by the dissemination of objective and topical information about the situation in the remaining colonies. We regard it as particularly essential to stand up against the attempts of some Western countries and their mass media to discredit the national liberation movements and to portray them as terrorists.

147. The accomplishment of decolonization still requires considerable efforts. A guideline on how to free mankind from the colonial anachronism is provided in the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration as contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/118. Its fulfilment is undoubtedly promoted by the conclusions of the Special Committee, of which the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is a member and a Vice-Chairman. May I be permitted on this occasion to express our appreciation for the responsible, qualified and dedicated work of Mr. Koroma of Sierra Leone as Chairman of the Special Committee. In the discharge of his duties he has proved his strong commitment to the ideals of decolonization and personally contributed to the work of the Committee which, this year too, presented a number of timely and consistent conclusions aimed at the immediate unconditional completion of decolonization. The Czechoslovak delegation supports these conclusions, as well as any other measures designed to put an end to the colonial stage in the history of mankind.

148. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia): The General Assembly is considering the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples at a crucial time. Next year the United Nations and progressive mankind will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the historic Declaration, and in that connection the international community will evaluate the progress achieved during the 25 years of its implementation and will formulate specific measures for the elimination of the remaining vestiges of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

149. The adoption of the Declaration by the General Assembly and its subsequent implementation, involving a wider decolonization process, have undoubtedly constituted one of the major achievements of the United Nations. I hope that when the Organization celebrates its fortieth anniversary next year evaluation of the Declaration and the decolonization process will cause them to be accorded a proper place among the Organization's achievements. However, there is very little time left for formulating and carrying out broad measures for the eradication of the last vestiges of colonialism. Thus, in the preparations for the celebration of the anniversary of that historic document in a meaningful and worthy manner, much has to be done in the remaining short span of time.

150. Today the question of the situation in and around Namibia remains outstanding and is a cause of deep concern to the international community. The peoples of about 20 small Territories to which the Declaration applies are still deprived of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The recent full-scale debate on the question of Namibia revealed the gravity of the situation in the south of Africa and the urgency of a solution. Not only are the people of Namibia deprived of their inalienable right to self-determination and freedom, but their Territory, illegally occupied by the racist régime, is used for acts of aggression against independent African States, while its human and natural resources are being ruthlessly exploited and plundered by the imperialist monopolies and the racist authorities. The question of Namibia has always been treated as a decolonization issue and as such should be resolved in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration and other relevant United Nations resolutions.

151. As far as the so-called specific or small Territories are concerned, we fully share the conviction reiterated by the Special Committee that questions of territorial size, geographical isolation or limited resources should not in any way affect the inalienable right of the inhabitants of those Territories to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration. In this regard, special attention should be paid to the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The United States, the administering Power, instead of creating appropriate conditions and preparing the local populations for the exercise of their right to self-determination, uses the Trust Territory for its own economic and strategic interests in violation of the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement and the provisions of the Declaration. The economies of the Territory remain fully dependent on the administering Authority, while the lands are turned into military bases. The same could also be said with regard to Puerto Rico. The presence of military bases and installations in the colonial Territories not only constitutes a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration but also poses a threat to international peace and security. We have witnessed how these bases have been used for acts of aggression against sovereign States and repression of national liberation movements. That is why we join in the demand that the military bases and installations of the colonial Powers be immediately and unconditionally withdrawn from colonial Territories.

152. The activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories, manifested in the ruthless exploitation and plunder of the natural and human resources, are recognized by the world community as being among the major obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration. The indigenous peoples, which have so far lived under colonial domination, have the full right to own and freely dispose of the natural resources of their Territories. This inherent right should be safeguarded and guaranteed. It is most regrettable that the imperialist and colonial Powers not only allow their monopolies and transnational corporations to plunder the natural wealth of the dependent Territories but also collaborate with one another in the political, economic and strategic fields in order to prolong their colonial and racial domination in colonial Territories. I refer to the special relations between some Western Powers and South Africa.

153. We once again condemn the collusion by the Governments of the United States and some other Western Powers with the racist régime of South Africa, in particular in the nuclear field, and we join in the call for States to terminate all collaboration with South Africa and to refrain from entering into any relations with the racist Pretoria régime. In our

opinion, this purpose will best be served by the application against South Africa of comprehensive mandatory sanctions as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

154. Our delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the Special Committee, which has done commendable work in the period under review. We have no difficulty whatsoever in endorsing the recommendations contained in its report and its future work programme. We appreciate the Special Committee's intention to pursue its efforts in seeking the best ways and means to ensure the immediate and full implementation of the Declaration in all Territories which have not yet attained independence and to continue to examine compliance by Member States with the Declaration and other relevant resolutions on decolonization. That is all the more important in view of the celebration next year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration. The best way to celebrate this historic date would be by the complete elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism and racism.

155. Mr. SAIGNAVONGS (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Next year we shall be celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This historic Declaration has almost completely transformed the political map of the world, because since its adoption in 1960 a large number of countries and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America which were then under colonial domination have acceded to independence and have become Members of the Organization. This year, with the admission of Brunei Darussalam to the United Nations, we have witnessed a further victory of the progressive forces in their struggle against colonialism and imperialism and for peace and freedom for the peoples.

156. However, in spite of the recommendations in the 1960 Declaration and the programme of action and Plan of Action for its full implementation, contained, respectively, in General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) and the annex to resolution 35/118, colonialism has not yet disappeared. There remain in certain parts of the world—particularly in southern Africa and in the Indian Ocean, the Pacific, the south Atlantic and the Caribbean—Territories still under colonial domination and peoples deprived of their right to equality and self-determination. Indeed, it is a scandal that at the beginning of the space age major Territories such as Namibia and Puerto Rico retain an anachronistic colonial status inherited from a bygone era. Moreover, those that have become independent are far from having finished with neocolonialist domination and the attempts of the colonialists and imperialists to regain their lost positions.

157. What, then, still delays the decolonization process, which began so well?

158. First, there are the military and strategic interests of the colonial Powers. It is well known that the Non-Self-Governing Territories which the administering Powers do not wish to relinquish are those which have a certain strategic importance for those Powers, either because of their location in a sensitive region or because they control one or more international shipping lanes. In many cases, in view of that importance, the administering Powers have built or planned to build military bases or installations in these Territories in violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

159. The presence of these military bases or installations not only prevents the populations of the Territories from exercising their right of self-determination and independence, but can also involve the Territories in acts of hostility or interference against other States. That happened in the case of Guam, which was virtually annexed by the administering Power, which in the recent past used it as a base for aggression against Viet Nam. It happened in the case of Puerto Rico, which was transformed by the United States into a staging area for its aggression in the Caribbean and from which last year the United States launched its invasion of Grenada. It happened in the case of Diego Garcia, which was emptied of its indigenous population and transformed into a United States naval air base to control the Indian Ocean and for the stationing of rapid deployment forces ready to intervene at any time in the Middle East and Persian Gulf region to protect the so-called vital interests of the United States. It happened in the case of Micronesia, which the administering Power has split up and is transforming into a strategic naval air base, a testing ground for missiles and a storehouse for weapons of mass destruction. It happened in the case of Namibia, which is illegally occupied by South Africa, which has built up its military presence there to repress the national liberation movement of the Namibian people and to carry out acts of aggression against neighbouring independent States, particularly Angola.

160. It is clear that the maintenance of military bases and installations and the other military activities of the colonial Powers in these colonial Territories constitute a direct threat to international peace and security. The vast majority of the States Members of the Organization are opposed to this.

161. Another obstacle to the decolonization process is the economic and financial interests of the administering Powers and their allies, represented by their monopolies or transnational corporations. Having invested capital in the low-cost exploitation of the natural and human resources of the colonial Territories where they enjoy certain privileges, these monopolies seek only to amass and repatriate large profits, to the detriment of the indigenous populations. The activities of these foreign economic interests in their pursuit of massive profits and their careless exploitation of the natural resources of these Territories deprive the indigenous populations of their rights over the wealth of their own countries. The most striking example of this is to be found in Namibia.

162. These monopolies, the true heirs of traditional colonial exploitation, are based in certain Western countries, which protect them, help them or encourage them to continue their expansion.

163. These Powers pay lip-service to the rejection of colonialism. In the case of Namibia they even associate themselves with anti-colonialist and anti-*apartheid* declarations, but at the same time they protect, support and assist the Pretoria régime they condemn. Whenever it is a question of adopting effective measures or sanctions against that régime, these Powers block the proposal. When such measures are adopted, these Powers bypass or ignore them.

164. The truth is that the colonialist and imperialist Powers are not prepared to reconcile themselves to being deprived of the wealth of the colonial Territories. They are afraid of losing those Territories as sources of profit and as strategic bases. This also explains why the administering Powers delay the adoption of effective measures to allow the peoples of certain colonial Territories to exercise their right of self-determination and independence. But the more these colonialist Powers and régimes try to prolong their occupation of these Territories by stifling the aspiration of their peoples to independence and freedom, the more fierce and resolute the resistance to oppression of those peoples, through their national liberation movements, becomes.

165. Certainly, at the outset no people under colonial domination favours violence. But, confronted with the increasing intransigence and arrogance of the oppressors, these peoples, determined to gain their freedom and independence, find themselves inevitably committed to armed struggle, which has been recognized as legitimate by the international community.

166. For its part, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, as a peaceable country, joins other Members of the Organization in demanding the full, immediate implementation of the Declaration, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Having itself made enormous sacrifices in its own 30-year national liberation struggle, the Lao people stands in solidarity with all peoples still under colonial or foreign domination struggling for independence and freedom.

167. My delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the Special Committee, whose activities were outlined at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting by its Rapporteur and its Chairman. The Committee has made a praiseworthy effort to analyse the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. My delegation hopes that the Assembly will support and co-operate in the fulfilment of the Committee's mandate.

168. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I hope that members will indulge me if I begin on a personal note. This is the first time I have spoken formally in this Hall representing my country, the United States of America. It is with a heart filled with pride and awe that I, the grandson of immigrants who came to these shores 78 years ago, now stand in this historic place to address the representatives to the United Nations assembled here in New York.

169. I think it is particularly appropriate that decolonization should be the subject of my first statement. It is precisely because of the process of decolonization which began here in America 206 years ago that my grandparents were able to come to this country. That first decolonization process began in July 1776 when another group of delegates assembled just a hundred or so miles from here, and a few days later they adopted a decolonization resolution which read, in part:

> "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and Nature's God entitled them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.
>
> "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—that whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Those words of Thomas Jefferson, written more than two centuries ago, must echo still in all their majesty as we look yet again at the problems of colonialism and decolonization.

170. Most attention has been given to Mr. Jefferson's statement on inalienable rights, and this is just and proper. But in this debate we should focus on what is in fact the charter of decolonization:

> "It is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Written at a time when shahs and kings, sultans and rajahs claimed that God had given them the right to rule as they pleased and to rule whomever they could conquer, this Declaration said: It is the people who are sovereign, and they may select the Government that seems to them best. The basis of that selection was not the pleasure of rulers or the whim of conquerors, but rather their own decision as to what would be most likely to ensure their safety and happiness.

171. The effect of those words has been far-reaching indeed. It is natural for people to seek liberty and just Government. So, throughout the nineteenth century there were repeated waves of decolonization and the struggle for national liberation. In Latin America there were the great heroes Simón Bolívar the Liberator, José San Martín, Benito Juárez and the others who freed a continent and created the republics of the inter-American system.

172. In Europe the nineteenth century brought freedom from foreign domination to Greece, Romania, Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Belgium and Norway. Meanwhile, the cities and principalities of Germany and Italy coalesced into nation-States. Australia, Canada and New Zealand became self-governing dominions within the British Empire.

173. But even as these countries achieved independent nationhood some of them—and some of the older Powers—set out to colonize Asia and Africa and to transform the proud old States of the Middle East into dependencies. So the end of the nineteenth century became, at one and the same time, an era of growing prosperity and freedom for some and a time of arbitrary rule and exploitation for others.

174. Someone has called colonialism "the poisoned rose", corrupting even as it attracts. The era of colonialism brought roads and schools and hospitals, yet it brought dehumanization as well. How were those who preached justice and humanity at home to explain their denial in the colonial Territories they

ruled? They could do so only by inventing fantasies of racial or other superiority. And so they created societies of two castes, the occupiers and those they occupied. And so those who were the occupied were dehumanized, and those who did the occupying were corrupted. The poisoned rose kills all who come near.

175. All that has passed, and we may be thankful for it. The end of the First World War saw ancient Poland resume its place in the family of nations along with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Czechoslovakia. In the even greater wave of decolonization after the Second World War many proud States were reborn or created—India, Pakistan, the Philippines and Indonesia all became independent, and the period of enforced tutelage ended for Syria, Iraq, Egypt, Sri Lanka, Burma, Sudan and Morocco. Algeria followed and then, in a great rush, the late 1950s and early 1960s saw the dismantling of the Belgian, French and British Empires in Africa and elsewhere. In fact, by the time General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted most of the work of decolonization had either taken place already or was in process.

176. Some here may recall the name C. Northcote Parkinson, the British economist, philosopher and humorist best known for Parkinson's Law. Parkinson's Law has it that work will expand and expand until it occupies all the time of those available to perform the work—and this without reference to the intrinsic value of the work done. Parkinson also observed that it is easy to tell the difference between a dynamic, growing organization and one which is past its prime. In the vibrant, growing organization people work in a jumble of makeshift offices using whatever furniture they can lay their hands on. This is because they are too busy working to worry overmuch about housekeeping. Yet in the tired, past-its-prime organization the offices are immaculate and very well furnished; everyone has a place, and all they do is read each other's reports.

177. Obviously, all should tremble at such analysis, but it seems to me that none need tremble more than we who work on decolonization matters in the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee, for we have evolved increasingly elaborate structures for dealing with less and less.

178. We should recall that, excluding Namibia, the total population of all of the areas on the General Assembly's list of Non-Self-Governing Territories is just about 500,000 people. That is to say, that total is just about equal to the population of Staten Island, the smallest of New York City's five boroughs. Surely, we should be thinking of making our machinery less elaborate and more proportional to the problems that remain. Yet we are considering resolutions which call for the widest possible dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of colonialism, as though some were proposing a wave of recolonization. And we are asked to greatly increase, at some very considerable cost, the Department of Public Information's anti-colonialist publicity, especially in Western Europe and the Americas.

179. Does it sound in any way suggestive to the Assembly that we are asked to fund new propaganda efforts primarily in Western Europe and the Americas? Do members somehow get the idea that what is at work here is yet another attempt by those who are pursuing a cold-war agenda? Do those who pursue these topics seriously wish us to believe that there are cabals in Western Europe and that unless we spend all this money Portugal will again seize Mozambique or that the United Kingdom will return in colonial splendour to Ghana?

180. And while we are speaking of those who use decolonization as a vehicle for cold-war propoganda, let me say that my delegation deeply resents the efforts of those cold warriors—including those whom we have heard this afternoon—who seek to interfere in the internal affairs of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a completely self-governing territory, where repeated acts of self-determination have taken place and have been recognized by the Assembly, and where free and fair elections are held every four years, most recently in November this year. In those elections, the Puerto Rican people do not have to choose from a single slate of candidates and they are not given only the right to vote "yes" or "no" against that single slate. Instead, they may choose from a multiplicity of ideological and political stands, including independence. We recognize no right to interfere in those internal affairs. In view of the repeated action by this Assembly, and in view of the fact that Puerto Rico has full internal self-government recognized by the Assembly, we consider that the attempts by some to have the Special Committee or the Fourth Committee take up Puerto Rico to be completely *ultra vires*. So too would we regard any attempt to drag this matter in through the back door by having the Secretariat prepare a special report. Those who have adopted this tactic should be aware that it is no more legitimate than would be an instruction to the Secretariat to prepare a special report on the separation of Slovakia or independence for Kazakhstan. We are gratified that the Chairman of the Special Committee has assured the Assembly that further consultations must and will precede any action in this regard. Surely, we need not drag cold-war politics into our work, or at least not any more than has already been done this afternoon.

181. If the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee are not to be the areas where the cold-war junta presides, what should they be, what should they become? I think it is time we took a hard look at the entire question of dependency, free of mythology and free of false rhetoric. Within the Special Committee and within the Fourth Committee some of the speakers come very close to asserting that each and every small group, each and every ethnic group, must constitute a nation in and of itself. Yet the very nations that make this assertion very often themselves are multinationality States. Indeed, almost every Member of the United Nations is in fact an amalgam of ethnic groups and tribes. Should Papua New Guinea be forced to divide into 700 mini-states because there are 700 tribes living there? This obviously is an absurdity. But some of these tribes live on islands of their own. Why should these islands not come to constitute separate nations? The difference should be obvious. They choose not to. They know that in political unity lies strength and the possibility of progress, so they join together in the new and dynamic nation of Papua New Guinea, just as the original 13 colonies here joined together in a political unity.

182. But meanwhile, as we all know, resolution 1514 (XV) says that small size or adverse geographic location may not be used as reasons to avoid decolonization. So, therefore, shall we demand nationhood for Pitcairn Island and its 53 inhabitants? Would it be rational for us to do that? And if the

Special Committee did so, would Great Britain be obligated to comply with such a prescription?

183. It seems to me that we have to learn to draw better and wiser distinctions now that the basic work of decolonization is completed. We should begin with the distinction that decolonization does not necessarily mean we must break things down into smaller and smaller and yet smaller units. We need to go back to the words of Thomas Jefferson and remember that the object of Government is the safety and happiness of the governed. A very famous statesman, a former Prime Minister, once said that we must give independence to all ethnically distinct territories, even if only a small minority of the population concerned wishes it. Even if only 3 per cent wishes it, he said. He was mistaken and he remains mistaken. If the Cook Islands choose free association with New Zealand as a matter of their safety and happiness, so be it. If the people of Kazakhstan believe that their safety and happiness is best assured as a Republic within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that should be, that must be acceptable to all of us.

184. The United States of America, which began the enterprise of decolonization 206 years ago, will continue its efforts to bring the last chapter of traditional colonialism to an end. We will continue to work actively, hard and patiently to bring Namibia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Of course, we will co-operate with the Trusteeship Council to terminate the last remaining Trust Territory of the United Nations in accordance with the wishes of the inhabitants of those islands. We will continue self-rule; we will continue to further self-expression in American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands and we will co-operate closely with the Special Committee in its consideration of those Territories. Looking beyond, looking into the future, we will work together with all to do everything we can to ensure legitimate self-determination for all dependent peoples and Territories.

185. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

186. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): The representative of the Soviet Union repeated a statement which he made in the Fourth Committee, implying that British military activity in the Falkland Islands was directed against some kind of Falkland Islands liberation movement. I asked him then in an off-the-cuff exercise of the right of reply for details and, off the cuff, he had nothing to say on the subject. I find it amazing—and indeed a matter of some gravity—that he should now mislead the Assembly by repeating the same insinuation in the debate in the plenary meeting. I really think he owes it to us all to attempt to justify his statement or to withdraw it. For the record, no such movement exists.

187. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I am surprised at the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom because, just as in the Fourth Committee, he quoted inaccurately what I said.

188. Neither in the Fourth Committee nor here in the plenary meeting did I talk about the national liberation movement in the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands. The representative of the United Kingdom could consult the records of the meetings of both the Fourth Committee and the Assembly. Let me repeat what I said:

> "The war waged by the United Kingdom to restore the colonial status"—the colonial status—"of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands showed how dangerous it is for the cause of peace that there should continue to be any colonial possessions, however small. The colonial Powers are trying to hold on to those possessions, even if it means waging large-scale colonial wars."

That is what I said, and it was indeed a colonial war waged by Great Britain in the second half of the twentieth century.

189. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): I think the representative of the Soviet Union is looking at a different text from the one he used this afternoon. The text that he used this afternoon—and which his colleagues were kind enough to give me—contains a paragraph which lists a number of dependent Territories, including the Falkland Islands, and goes on to say that "military activity in dependent Territories [is] used above all . . . to suppress the national liberation movements".

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

NOTES

[1] Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

86th
PLENARY MEETING

*Wednesday, 5 December 1984,
at 10.55 a.m.*

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 18

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. VELAZCO SAN JOSÉ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Next year the international community will commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. That will give us an opportunity to take stock of the victories scored in the struggle against colonialism and of the efforts the Organization must continue to make in support of the peoples still struggling for self-determination and independence.

2. It is precisely in the sphere of decolonization that the Organization, on the eve of its fortieth anniversary, can be satisfied with the work done in support of one of the fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

3. In this context, we welcome the accession of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic as a full member of the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*]. That is a great victory for the Saharan people in particular and for African peoples in general.

4. In spite of the many achievements in this field, the agenda of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples—which does not cover all the Territories to which resolution 1514 (XV) applies—is living proof of the important work that the Organization still must do in support of the struggle of peoples to free themselves from the last vestiges of colonial domination.

5. The most dramatic case is the one we have just completed considering in the Assembly—that is, the question of Namibia. But there is colonialism in the Indian Ocean region, where the Comorian island of Mayotte, the Malagasy Islands and Diego Garcia must be returned to the sovereignty of, respectively, the Comoros, Madagascar and Mauritius. In the Caribbean, we find the most important colonial possession of the United States, Puerto Rico, and other Territories which, under the obsolete term "overseas departments", are deprived of self-determination by various European Powers. Farther down, in the South Atlantic, Argentina is being denied sovereignty over the Malvinas, Georgias and South Sandwich Islands. The so-called small Territories, dealt with by a subsidiary body of the Special Committee, include many colonies, mainly Micronesia, which are the objects of sophisticated manoeuvres orchestrated by the administering Powers to hamper the exercise by those peoples of their right to self-determination and independence.

6. A new type of colonialism—neo-colonialism—imposed by imperialism on many of the young independent States, has been taking new wings in recent years through a brutal policy of pressure and blackmail aimed at undermining the political independence of those States and firmly tying them as appendages to the imperialist system of dependency and economic exploitation. In these endeavours the imperialist Powers, in particular the United States, try to exploit the tragic economic situation, which in many countries of the third world is made worse by the economic crisis generated in the capitalist world.

7. On the other hand, the policy of aggression and expansion of imperialism and its pawns in the Middle East and in southern Africa—Israel and South Africa—has given rise to colonialism of a new stripe, which can be seen in the Israeli plans to bring about the definitive annexation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan Heights, and in the neo-colonial attempts by the Pretoria racist régime against the independent neighbouring States and front-line States.

8. The process of decolonization has in fact come to a standstill in some of the most critical areas, particularly in Namibia, where the *apartheid* régime, encouraged by the policy of "constructive engagement" of the current American Administration and the political, diplomatic, economic and military support it receives from Washington, disregards the will of the international community and persists in maintaining by force the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia in disregard of repeated Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

9. In considering the Territories still under colonial domination, one clearly sees the motivations that explain why colonial Powers resist abandoning those possessions. In some cases they benefit from the juicy profits they extract from economic exploitation, especially advantageous in colonial conditions, and in other cases these interests also relate to military-strategic objectives.

10. At this session the General Assembly will reach decisions on the draft resolutions on the item before us which unequivocally condemn the exploitation of

colonial Territories by the colonial Powers and their transnational corporations, as well as the use of those Territories for military ends, since both practices are serious obstacles to the process of self-determination and independence.

11. The Territories of Namibia, Micronesia, Diego Garcia, Guam, Bermuda and especially Puerto Rico—only to mention the most salient cases—are living examples of the utilization of colonial Territories for military purposes related to the global aggressive strategy of imperialism.

12. Cuba has always considered this type of activity not only as being extremely dangerous to the exercise of the right of those peoples to self-determination and independence, but also as a threat and a danger to the security of independent neighbouring States.

13. Certain recent events in the Caribbean have strengthened my country's conviction that the United Nations and the international community in general must redouble their efforts to end the utilization of colonial Territories, whether for purposes of installing bases or for carrying out other military activities.

14. To the use by the United States of the island of Vieques, which is part of the colonial Territory of Puerto Rico, as a training area for the aggression which two years later it launched against the small island of Grenada, we must add the progressive militarization of Puerto Rico and its use as a base for military manoeuvres in the context of the aggressive plans of the present American Administration against peoples of the Caribbean and Central America, in particular of Nicaragua and Cuba.

15. Precisely this aspect—the militarization of the Territory of Puerto Rico—was the object of a comprehensive analysis when in August this year the item was considered at plenary meetings of the Special Committee. At that time the members of the Committee had occasion to hear statements by many petitioners who represented all Puerto Rican political parties without exception as well as the most important social, professional and cultural organizations and by groups, institutions and distinguished persons from the political, religious, social and cultural spheres in that Territory. All of those statements are irrefutable proof of the fact that the people of Puerto Rico are not satisfied with the present political status which hinders the realization of their legitimate aspirations.

16. In keeping with its historical commitment rooted in the libertarian thinking of Jose Martí, Juárez, Bolívar, Bustos, Betances and Albizu Campos, Cuba has for many years been defending the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence, in keeping with resolution 1514 (XV).

17. We remain convinced that sooner or later the brother people of Puerto Rico will join, as an independent sovereign State, the great Latin American family, from whose ranks, history, culture and common roots the colonial Power will not be able to separate it, however much it may do to distort historical reality, destroy its national identity, bring its economic structures in line with the interests of American transnationals and use the sons of the Puerto Rican people as cannon fodder in its wars and imperialistic adventures.

18. In accordance with chapter II of the report of the Special Committee [*A/39/23*], the General Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution on the Programme of Activities in Observance of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We trust that the active participation of all Member States, the United Nations bodies concerned, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and the non-governmental organizations active in the field of decolonization will contribute to making this historic event an important milestone among the efforts of the international community to eliminate the last vestiges of colonialism through firm and decided support for those peoples still struggling to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

19. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): In the lives of countries and peoples, as in those of individuals, there are certain events which to a great extent determine their future. For many peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, such an event was the adoption at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This truly historic act marked the resolve of all progressive and peace-loving forces once and for all to put an end to colonialism and represented international, legal confirmation of the legitimacy of the struggle for national liberation and the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and independence.

20. On the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration, we are indeed gratified to note the major successes that have been achieved in the fulfilment of its lofty ideals. Colonial empires have crumbled, and from their ruins have arisen dozens of new independent States. They have confirmed their status in the international arena as sovereign and equal participants in the world society. Their international authority is growing, and their positive contributions to the resolution of world problems is increasing. This is a great victory for the peoples in the national liberation struggle and an important step towards the complete elimination of colonialism, that pernicious phenomenon in the history of mankind.

21. However, the forces of imperialism and reaction do not wish to reconcile themselves to the realities of the times. They have arbitrarily declared certain areas to be zones of their "vital interests", including vast expanses of ocean and other peoples' coastlines, and are trying to impose their will on other peoples. The United States aggression against Grenada, the crises in southern Africa, the Middle East and Central America—all these are results of imperialist policies of hegemonism and expansion and of attempts to erect a barrier to progressive reforms in the world. It is precisely because of such policies that colonialism has not yet been ended and the sacred right to self-determination and independence remains but a dream for the peoples of more than 20 countries and territories.

22. In that regard, we are particularly alarmed at the situation prevailing in the southern part of the African continent, where the racist régime of South Africa, while sabotaging the numerous relevant United Nations resolutions, is continuing illegally to occupy Namibia and is endeavouring to stifle by force of arms the aspirations of the people to

liberation and independence and to maintain the colonial system there. At the same time the racists of Pretoria are carrying out acts of aggression and subversion against neighbouring African States to try to force them to cease their assistance and support for the national liberation movement of the Namibian people.

23. As is indicated in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, the South African régime "is able to defy the United Nations, act as an outlaw and give the appearance of strength only because of the collusion and support of the United States of America, certain other Western Powers and Israel, as well as a number of transnational corporations and financial institutions" [*see A/39/22, para. 328*].

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR strongly condemns the actions of those circles and States which, under the cover of statements about their devotion to the purposes and principles of the Declaration on decolonization, give assistance to the *apartheid* régime and encourage it in further acts of illegality, aggression and intransigence with regard to the matter of granting independence to Namibia.

24. In Washington South Africa is openly called a friend and an "historical ally". The United States is pursuing a policy of "constructive engagement" with the Pretoria régime, hoping in this way to safeguard its own economic and strategic interests in the southern part of the African continent. Recently the racists and their protectors have been undertaking joint efforts to "link" the Namibian problem with other matters which are completely irrelevant, in order to postpone indefinitely the granting of independence to the people of Namibia. These unsavoury manoeuvres are aimed at taking the solution of the problem of Namibia outside the United Nations and at destroying the foundation for a true settlement set out in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other United Nations resolutions. The Ukrainian SSR categorically condemns such manoeuvres. We favour the immediate exercise by the people of Namibia of its legal right to self-determination and independence, the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of the country, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, and the transfer of full authority to the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], which has been recognized by the United Nations and the OAU as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia.

25. The adoption of effective measures in accordance with United Nations resolutions to remove the hotbed of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in the southern part of Africa is an urgent requirement of the present day. The United Nations and all democratic and peace-loving forces on earth should redouble their efforts to isolate that racist régime. We fully uphold the demands of the African States that the Security Council immediately impose against South Africa comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We also believe it is essential that all States strictly observe the sanctions which have already been imposed on South Africa.

26. Unfortunately, failure to comply with the provisions of the declaration on decolonization has not been restricted to southern Africa. No solution has yet been found in regard to the decolonization of a number of so-called small dependent Territories situated in various parts of the oceans and seas. The point here is by no means that these Territories are small in size or have small populations, although this is precisely the excuse used by the administering Powers to justify their refusal to grant them the right to self-determination and independence. The real reason is to be found elsewhere. The military and strategic locations of these Territories and the militaristic plans of those in the more aggressive circles of imperialism explain the stubborn attempts of the administering Powers to preserve these remnants of their colonial possessions. Using these Territories, mostly islands, as military bases and beach-heads for strategic purposes in certain parts of the world, despite the will of the populations, the administering Powers give very little thought to the fate or aspirations of the indigenous people.

27. The most typical example of how the right of peoples to self-determination is being called in question, if not completely denied, for purely selfish reasons, is the action of the United States with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia). When in 1947 the United States took over the administration of Micronesia it made a solemn commitment to promote the "political, economic and social progress" of the local population and "its development towards self-determination and independence". But, as subsequent events demonstrated, the real purposes of the administering Power had nothing in common with the injunctions of the United Nations. From the outset the United States attempted to annex the islands, declaring them to be of strategic and vital interest to it. Scoffing at the very concept of self-determination, the United States, for the 37 years during which the trusteeship has been in effect, has tried to impose its own will on the Micronesian people by the use of brute force.

28. Because of the efforts of the administering Power, Micronesia has been divided into a number of State entities, and each of them faces the fate of becoming a United States colony. Moreover, the United States has arrogated to itself the right to use parts of Micronesia to deploy, store and experiment with nuclear weapons and poisonous chemical substances. In addition to the military bases that already exist, new military installations are being planned. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the treaties which have been proposed by the United States—the so-called covenants and compacts based on the ideas of commonwealth and free association of Micronesia with the administering Power—are essentially equivalent to acts of recolonization. They cannot replace the status of a free and independent State.

29. The militarization of the Pacific Islands poses a grave threat to the security of peoples, not only in Micronesia but also in Asia and Oceania. It could give rise to a new source of tension. These United States actions towards the Trust Territory violate the Charter of the United Nations, the trusteeship agreement between the Security Council and the United States, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other United Nations resolutions. Thus, they cannot and must not be acknowledged to be just or to have any legal force.

30. The plans of the imperialist States to realize their hegemonistic and militaristic aspirations allow of no exceptions for other Territories in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans and in the Caribbean.

31. Thus, the island of Diego Garcia—which formerly belonged to Mauritius and was illegally seized by the United Kingdom and leased to the United States—has been turned by the United States into a major modern nuclear naval base in the Indian Ocean. This represents a threat to the security and stability of the region. With regard to the local population, the new owners, having decided to get rid of witnesses, have expelled all the island's inhabitants, depriving them of their homeland.

32. The island of Puerto Rico is a virtual United States colony in the Caribbean. It is used as a military beach-head for intervention in the internal affairs of other countries of the region.

33. Nor is the South Atlantic free from vestiges of the colonial past. The armed conflict which arose there over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands was a clear demonstration of the true attitude of Great Britain and its closest allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] to the problems of decolonization. It was also convincing proof of the need for the immediate, final elimination of colonialism everywhere and in every form.

34. That is the basic, consistent position which has always motivated the Ukrainian SSR on questions concerning the speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We offer our friendship to all those struggling for freedom and independence and for the right to decide their own future in full independence, and they have our constant support.

35. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): Last year saw the accession of Saint Christopher and Nevis to membership of the United Nations. This year we welcomed Brunei Darussalam as the Organization's 159th Member. The coming to independence of these two countries represents classic examples of the peaceful change which has transformed what was once an empire into a unique Commonwealth. Their admission to the United Nations brings us even closer to the goal of universality. Their emergence as new nations is an occasion for celebration, yet one would hardly think so from much that has been said in this debate. One would have thought that the process of decolonization had hardly advanced in the last 40 years, that it still deserved the same priority as was accorded to it in the early years of the Organization.

36. We are not here to perpetuate myths. The fact is that the process of decolonization is close to an end. The achievements have been many. The number of Non-Self-Governing Territories has dwindled, so that now only 15 or so are left. As far as the remaining British dependent Territories are concerned, all have stressed that they are not yet ready for independence. All have made it clear that they do not wish to break their links with the United Kingdom. We respect those wishes. It is the people who should decide the pace of constitutional advance. We shall not force them into independence against their will, and we shall not stand in the way of independence if that accords with their wishes, expressed through their elected representatives.

37. If anyone harbours any doubts about the swift pace of decolonization, let me point out that after the founding of the United Nations, but before the adoption in 1960 of the declaration on decolonization—a point overlooked by a number of speakers—some 33 colonial and Trust Territories, 10 of them British, with a combined population of some 1 billion people, had secured their independence. By the time the Declaration was adopted, a further four Territories, with a population amounting to some 4.5 million, were already proceeding to independence, and the groundwork for independence in other British colonial Territories had been laid. By 1965 all British dependent Territories in Africa had achieved independence, with the exception of Rhodesia, which was under an illegal régime. Leaving aside for the moment Hong Kong, to which special considerations apply since it is not on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, what remains now is a group of small island Territories which together make up a population approaching 150,000.

38. That, then, is the sum total of our present colonial responsibilities: 150,000 souls. There is no question of the United Kingdom maintaining colonial rule over these people for its own sake. We do so because the people wish it, and we do so because we recognize that we have obligations placed on us by Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations, obligations we take seriously and observe scrupulously. Yet speeches today have implied, as do the draft resolutions before us, that colonialism serves only the interests of the administering Powers at the expense of those they administer. To the very limited extent that my country is still an administering Power, that is far from the truth.

39. If I may make a personal comment, the process of decolonization had been accepted by my country and the wind of change was blowing strongly by the time I began my professional life in the British diplomatic service 24 years ago. I am perhaps unusual in my generation of British officials in having been actively involved in bringing a former British colony, Aden, to independence. This is a matter of pride to me personally, compounded with regret that the independent State, most unusually, did not decide to join the Commonwealth. For most of my generation, and for most representatives of former British Territories in the Organization, decolonization is now a matter of history.

40. I briefly mentioned Hong Kong. All present will remember that on 26 September this year the British and Chinese Governments initialled an agreement whereby the United Kingdom will continue to be responsible for the administration of Hong Kong until 1 July 1997. China will then resume sovereignty and Hong Kong will become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. As my Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Sir Geoffrey Howe, said during this year's general debate [*9th meeting*], the agreement is a triumph of good sense and shows how, in the search for solutions to international problems, agreement is possible only with courage, imagination and political will on all sides. The "one country, two systems" approach to Hong Kong is a most positive example of this.

41. Last month we reached another agreement involving a British dependent Territory, this time with Spain over Gibraltar. The agreement was contained in a joint communiqué issued in Brussels on 27 November [*A/39/732, annex*] after a meeting between the British Foreign Secretary and the Spanish Foreign Minister. This paves the way for implementation of the Lisbon Declaration of April 1980, which provided for the re-establishment of direct communication between Spain and Gibraltar and,

simultaneously, for the start of negotiations aimed at overcoming all differences between Britain and Spain over Gibraltar.

42. Delegations will note that my delegation and that of Spain have jointly submitted an amendment [*A/39/L.27*] to the draft consensus on Gibraltar [*see A/39/696, part I, para. 25*], which is to be considered by the General Assembly this afternoon. The amendment is designed to take account of this new development.

43. Many of those that speak each year in this debate persist in turning a blind eye to the great advances that have been made in the process of decolonization and find it simpler to trot out the slogans of a bygone age. We live now in a world vastly different from that of 40 years ago. It is time the United Nations adapted its practices as well as its attitudes to take account of the changes; otherwise the Organization undermines its own credibility and reduces its capacity to respond effectively to the solution of problems that are real and pressing. The British empire no longer exists—certainly not in the form envisaged in this debate. The Soviet empire, as my predecessor remarked in this debate last year, is another story. If we are to debate independence and colonial problems it is our duty to look at the problems of today, not those of the past.

44. We all know that much of what is said in this debate is prompted by a painful awareness of the evil of *apartheid* and the injustice of the situation in Namibia. None of us, whether a former colony or a former imperial Power, dissents from the view that the system of *apartheid* is abhorrent and an affront to human dignity. All of us look forward to the day when the people of South Africa can live in conditions of equality and justice. But the fact remains that *apartheid* is not a manifestation of colonialism. It is a massive and flagrant violation of human rights practised by a sovereign State within its own borders.

45. As far as Namibia is concerned, we all share the same hope, namely, to see Namibia achieve its independence in accordance with the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). But Namibia is unique. Special machinery has been set up at the United Nations to deal with it. Indeed, it has recently been debated, as has *apartheid*, in this very Assembly. Is it really profitable to go over the same ground again? And should the United Kingdom, as the administering Power of 10 dependent Territories which takes justified pride in the way it fulfils its obligations towards them, be subjected to the same wrath and indignation as is directed at the situation in southern Africa? The answer is clear, and I say again that the General Assembly can ultimately only bring discredit on itself by failing to acknowledge the distinction.

46. Delegations will understand when I say that we have considerable reservations concerning the draft resolutions before us. It is significant and deeply depressing that they are virtually identical to the resolutions that have been adopted in previous years. What a contrast to the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa [*resolution 39/29, annex*], adopted the day before yesterday by the Assembly, which was a measured and constructive response to the very real difficulties facing African countries in 1984.

47. Self-evidently then, the draft resolutions we are discussing today fail to take account of change. They turn a blind eye to one problem which I should like to mention, the distinction between self-determination and independence. Those former British colonial Territories where the people clearly wished for independence have now achieved it. The few Territories which remain are exceptional in that a process of self-determination does not lead, or does not immediately and unambiguously lead, to independence but to some other status. Representatives are familiar with the Falklands question, a case where the population of the Territory itself have made it clear that they wish to remain linked with my country. We find it strange that their right to self-determination is flatly denied by the Assembly—by the Assembly, not, as the representative of Czechoslovakia implied yesterday, by the United Kingdom. However, it is a fact that in most other cases the right to self-determination has been exercised and independence has been the result. So it is not surprising that many Member States should expect the two to go together. I find it more surprising that the representative of the Ukraine should be of the same view and treat self-determination and independence as identical. The representative of Byelorussia is to speak shortly. He made the same mistake last year and it will be interesting to see if he does it again. I am tempted to ask when, on the basis that self-determination equals independence, those two States expect to exercise the right to self-determination.

48. Let me point to a few instances where the texts before us seem particularly unsatisfactory. The draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration [*A/39/L.17 and Corr. 1 and Add. 1*], of 27 November, talks in its twelfth preambular paragraph of the need to eradicate "racial discrimination, *apartheid* and violations of the basic human rights of the peoples of colonial Territories". Note that it is "the peoples of colonial Territories" who are spoken of here, not merely Namibia. Indeed, Namibia is merely singled out as an example of a general phenomenon. Perhaps it is not we that are singled out for criticism here. But if not we, who then? I would stress that in British dependent Territories we do not violate basic human rights, or practice *apartheid*, a term which has a very specific meaning—that is, discrimination on the grounds of race as a matter of public policy. We do not in the United Kingdom or in our dependent Territories discriminate on the grounds of race as a matter of public policy. Indeed, if there are instances of racial discrimination in our dependent Territories they are dealt with severely. We find it insulting and offensive that it should even be suggested, however indirectly, that we do so discriminate.

49. In paragraph 2 of the same draft resolution we see a further expression of irrelevant dogma: racism and *apartheid* and, additionally, the "exploitation by foreign and other interests of economic and human resources" are referred to as if they were part and parcel of the administration of colonial Territories in 1984. Again, are we to take this seriously? We do not exploit the economic resources, or the people, of our Territories. But we do encourage private-sector investment, as we and so many other Governments encourage it in our own territory, confident that in so doing we create the conditions for sustained and healthy economic growth which in turn contributes to political stability. For we are deeply concerned to promote economic development and progress towards self-government in our dependent Territories. Were we not, we would hardly co-operate with

the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples or invite visiting missions to inspect our Territories, the great majority of which have now been visited by United Nations missions, many of them more than once.

50. Another criticism we have of this draft resolution relates to paragraph 10, which calls for the unconditional withdrawal of so-called military bases and installations from colonial Territories. This reflects an increasing trend in reports of the Special Committee, which has now extended its microscopic scrutiny of matters military to uninhabited Territories such as Ascension Island. The Committee has also, for no other reason, it seems, than to try to score points with impunity at our expense, thought fit to insert contentious and disobliging references to military activities into the draft resolution on Bermuda; this despite the fact that military bases have existed on Bermuda for many years without any reason for legitimate concern. Military facilities in our Territories are only there with the support and consent of the local inhabitants. It is extraordinary, though regrettably predictable, that they are depicted by certain delegations as forming part of some sinister military strategy. But what is rather more significant is that no evidence has been adduced to support these absurd allegations. I do not know which I find more surprising: to hear such allegations from countries like the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, which have repeatedly imposed their will on neighbours and allies by military force, or to hear them from countries like Mongolia, Afghanistan and the German Democratic Republic, in which foreign military bases are maintained.

51. The second draft resolution before us today, on the dissemination of information on decolonization [*A/39/L.18 and Add. 1*], is no better. It talks of disseminating information on the "evils and dangers" of colonialism, a phrase which cannot but be offensive to those dependent peoples that have chosen to maintain their links with the administering Power. More than that, far from contenting themselves with maintaining the present level of activity, the authors of the draft resolution call for an intensification of work in this area. There can be no possible justification for this at a time when the process of decolonization itself is near to conclusion.

52. We are far from impressed by the work currently being done by the United Nations in the field of dissemination of information on decolonization. We have, for example, had cause to question the provocative title given to the publication "Objective: Justice", implying as it does that justice in dependent Territories can only be achieved through decolonization. We were also appalled earlier in the year by a Department of Public Information publication entitled "The United Nations and Decolonization: A Teaching Guide". It was not only its inaccuracies and its distortion of the history of decolonization that concerned us; it was the offensive way in which it equated the elimination of colonialism with the eradication of disease. Indeed, colonialism was described in the guide as "another kind of world-wide sickness".

53. This publication summed up what is objectionable in United Nations work on decolonization: it represented little more than a piece of crude political propaganda, grossly misleading and positively insulting to certain Member States. Its publication can only have tarnished the United Nations reputation, and we found it extraordinary that the United Nations imprimatur could have been given to so biased an analysis. We know that attempts were made to improve it, but the publication should have been withdrawn altogether. If a teaching guide is necessary, it should provide a serious, balanced and intellectually respectable assessment of the subject that reflects the views of all States Members of the United Nations. This is particularly important if it is to be distributed to schoolchildren, who are impressionable and whose capacity for objective judgements and analysis is generally supposed to be limited—though I know schoolchildren who can tell fact from fiction.

54. I am not suggesting that the United Nations should not be free to issue publications about its work in this important area. The extent to which people today live in freedom or are subject to tyranny—the central theme of the teaching guide—is an extremely important subject. Whether the history of decolonization since the War can legitimately be considered in these terms is debatable, but in any serious consideration of colonialism it is of course necessary to consider both the good and the bad.

55. This leads me to the activities planned to mark the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the declaration on decolonization. These are set out in chapter II of the Special Committee's report [*A/39/23*]. Annexed to that chapter is the text of a letter which we sent to the Chairman earlier this year, recording my delegation's doubts about the purpose and value of the planned celebrations. There is therefore no need for me to set out at length our objections here. Given the advanced stage reached in the decolonization process, given the large number of British dependent Territories that achieved their independence before 1960 and given our reluctance to see the United Nations spend its limited resources on commemorating anniversaries rather than on tackling the pressing problems that face us today, we do not consider celebrations on the scale proposed to be justified.

56. What particularly troubles us is that both the proposed extraordinary session of the Special Committee and the two regional seminars are seen as taking place away from New York. This would increase substantially the cost of these events. We see no justification for this. What does the United Nations gain by holding these meetings elsewhere? We would at the very least have expected the United Nations to absorb the costs of these additional activities within existing resources, or that it would have been agreed that the countries hosting the seminars, and in particular the extraordinary session of the Committee, should pay for them. That this does not appear to be envisaged is a cause of disappointment for us and explains why we are unable to support this draft resolution. We do not believe what is proposed represents a sensible and proper use of the United Nations finances. Expenditure of this magnitude on unproductive tasks does not reflect well on the Organization. Nor are we convinced, on the basis of past experience, that the celebrations planned are likely either to highlight the progress so far achieved in decolonization or indeed to contribute in a sensible and constructive way to bringing the decolonization process to a speedy and peaceful end.

57. Let me conclude by saying that my delegation would be happy to join in appropriate celebrations commemorating the giant strides that have been made in the field of decolonization over the last 40 years. The fact that we are unwilling to concur in what is planned on this occasion reflects our concern that this will be used not as a springboard for furthering the interests of the remaining non-self-governing peoples, but as a sounding-board for those delegations which, for purely ideological reasons, want to multiply the opportunities the Organization provides to vilify those whose values and beliefs they fear. And if we are to continue to hold a debate on these lines year after year, now that the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, as conventionally defined, have dwindled to such a tiny number, I predict that attention will turn increasingly to those other large areas where even today whole nations continue to live under foreign domination.

58. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): Consideration of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is taking place on the eve of two remarkable anniversaries in the history of mankind: the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. It is natural on such an occasion to review the progress made thus far by the United Nations in this field.

59. The struggle against colonialism in all its forms and manifestations has occupied a prominent place in the overall activities of the United Nations. Since its founding, as we all well know, over 100 States have assumed their legitimate place in the Organization as a result of the steadfast and persistent struggle of their peoples and of the United Nations against colonial domination. It is only right that we should note in this respect the work and the role of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which, under the able guidance of its Chairman, Mr. Koroma of Sierra Leone, has made a valuable contribution to the speedy and unconditional implementation of the Declaration and to the eradication of all vestiges of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and, of course, *apartheid*.

60. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate the Special Committee and its Chairman on their relentless efforts in accordance with the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration. My country, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, faithful to its consistent and principled policy of support for the struggle of peoples against colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, will continue to contribute as a member of the Special Committee to the successful realization of the highly humane objectives of the Charter and the Declaration.

61. The dissolution of colonial empires and the acquisition of legitimate freedom and independence by many colonial peoples constitute a substantial step towards the definitive elimination of colonialism. These are certainly concrete and specific successes, yet we should note that colonialism in all its forms and manifestations has not been fully eradicated from the face of the planet. The vestiges of colonialism continue to poison the international climate, fuel old and new hotbeds of tension and conflict and increase the threat to international peace and security.

62. In the 25 years since the adoption, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, of the declaration on decolonization the forces of colonialism and racism and their racist allies have continually raised obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration. They have been trying openly, under various pretexts, to prolong their control over colonial Territories wherever they are to be found—in southern Africa, in the Caribbean, in the Indian, the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans—in order to safeguard their geostrategic or, as they call them, vital interests in those parts of the world. Moreover, the forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism have taken concrete steps to reverse the march of history by maintaining or regaining colonial dependencies in some parts of the world under various neo-colonial forms. Thus imperialism not only prolongs its presence in the colonial Territories and preserves its political, economic, financial and military-strategic interests, but has also been trying to compel a number of independent countries and peoples to abandon the road of their genuine national and social independence.

63. These actions not only violate the spirit and the letter of the Declaration and of the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 35/118, but also contravene the Charter of the United Nations. This in itself is a very serious violation, and the world community has every right to define the persistence of colonialism and the practice of *apartheid* as a crime against humanity.

64. In order to justify these violations, the advocates of colonialism are lavish in words, whereas their deeds are in disagreement with the clear and categorical will of the international community. For example, so far not a single colonial Power has complied with the call by the General Assembly in resolution 38/54 for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the military bases and installations from colonial Territories. The General Assembly has repeatedly emphasized that the presence of military bases and installations in colonial Territories is a direct impediment to the implementation of the Declaration. The colonialist forces cannot hide the clear and firm position of the overwhelming majority of Member States that the military activities of colonial Powers and the presence of military bases and installations in colonial Territories are an impediment to the speedy and full implementation of the Declaration.

65. As is evident from the developments in the Pacific, and particularly in Micronesia, where the administering Power continues to impose a neo-colonial solution, the military-strategic interests and the geostrategic aspirations of that Power are the root cause of its non-compliance with the Declaration with regard to this Territory. This is the case also with regard to Guam, where a third of the territory is occupied by military bases and installations.

66. From a global point of view, the military bases and installations of colonial Powers in colonial Territories are an important and integral part of the network of military bases of imperialism encompassing the whole world.

67. One example of the action, or inaction, of the colonialists in order to sabotage the implementation

of the Declaration has been their dire opposition to the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence by various colonial peoples in Africa in the recent past.

68. When the United Nations, in the face of the realities and under the pressure of the objective development of mankind's history, recognized the legitimacy of the national liberation struggle of the colonial peoples in Africa, the colonial Powers refused to follow the United Nations example. They still do.

69. When the United Nations, under the pressure of the objective development of the national liberation struggle, decided to recognize the legitimacy of the armed struggle of colonial peoples and their national liberation movements, the colonial Powers refused to go along with it. There were even arguments advanced at the time that the armed struggle of the colonial peoples to achieve their right to self-determination was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. Why then, we ask, do not those Powers admit that the existence of remnants of colonialism is also contrary to the Charter?

Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

70. When the United Nations stipulates clearly and unambiguously that resolution 1514 (XV) is the constitutional document on the basis of which all colonial situations must be resolved, colonial Powers have tried, and still try, to distort the letter and the spirit of that resolution. The colonial Powers have not come out loud and clear, without any reservations whatsoever, in favour of the right of colonial countries and peoples to self-determination and independence, as stipulated in the resolution.

71. It is high time for the colonial Powers to desist from their policy of defying the decisions of the United Nations on decolonization and to put an end to their manoeuvres to circumvent the decisions regarding Namibia and to undermine the efforts of the United Nations in the field of decolonization. The Organization should unswervingly and consistently take all steps and spare no effort for the speedy and unconditional implementation of the Declaration and for the total elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, despite the attempts to erect roadblocks on the road it has embarked upon.

72. Again this year the General Assembly has before it the Special Committee's report on its work with regard to the implementation of the declaration on decolonization. It is evident from this report that the colonial Powers still persist in delaying, under various pretexts, the application of decisions related to the implementation of the Declaration.

73. The General Assembly has just concluded its discussion on the question of Namibia. For many years it has been forced to hear time and again the same explanations for the continuing colonial role in Namibia—explanations that have not contributed to a solution of the problem.

74. In defiance of numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, the racist régime of South Africa continues to rely on the all-round support and protection of its allies, particularly the United States and Israel, in the economic, financial, diplomatic and military fields.

75. The culprit for the existing state of affairs is beyond any doubt South Africa, which tramples underfoot the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence and continues to seek a solution to the Namibian problem that is not in conformity with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, but in conformity with the designs and ambitions of its imperialist allies.

76. As can be seen from its report, the Special Committee considered a number of colonial Territories in respect of which its resolutions and decisions specifically reaffirmed its position of principle that the Declaration was fully applicable. Among those cases was included the question of Puerto Rico.

77. In this Hall and in other United Nations bodies, Member States have kept asking the question: How long will the international community have to listen to such rationalization condoning the racist exploitation of millions of people and the plunder of the natural wealth of colonial Territories?

78. We cannot brush aside the fact that the history of the struggle of the colonial countries and peoples shows that independence cannot be achieved by compromises but that it can be won only through concrete actions aimed at bringing about the full and free exercise of their inalienable right to freedom, self-determination and national independence by all available means at their disposal, including armed struggle.

79. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The call for the total elimination of colonialism contained in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has not lost any of its importance despite the fact that 24 years have passed since the Declaration's adoption. The successes scored since then encourage us to persist along that path with all our strength, so that the international community may decisively and definitively put an end to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

80. The fact that newly independent States are Members of the Organization is a source of satisfaction to us and due reward to the international community for its efforts to bring colonial countries and peoples to independence and liberty. I wish to take this opportunity to welcome the delegation of Brunei Darussalam, whose country recently acceded to independence and was admitted as a Member of the United Nations.

81. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has played an important role, and continues to do so, in terms of orienting the efforts of the Organization towards the full implementation of that Declaration. My delegation has had the honour to be a member of that Committee since its establishment, and it has been my privilege personally to work under the leadership of its Chairman, Mr. Koroma of Sierra Leone, to whom I pay a tribute for the competence and skill he has displayed as Chairman of the Committee, thus enabling it to discharge its mandate successfully. This can be seen from the report I had the honour to submit to the Assembly yesterday [*85th meeting*] in my capacity as its Rapporteur.

82. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic is convinced that that Committee will continue all its efforts to put an end to colonialism once and for all. We hope that this will happen as soon as possible so that we may witness this spectacular result.

83. Despite the striking success of the United Nations in the context of the implementation of the Declaration, we must note with regret that more than 4 million persons in more than 20 Territories are still deprived of autonomy and independence in their own lands. Four million Palestinians are still deprived of their right to self-determination in their territory and their homeland. More than 20 million Africans in South Africa and Namibia are still subjected to various forms of discrimination, persecution and military and racist occupation. They live in their country but they are deprived of their right to citizenship and are under the yoke of repression, persecution and humiliation, while their region continues to be a hotbed of colonialism in its most obnoxious form.

84. We must also note that political emancipation is not always coupled with economic independence and that the imperialist economic interests continue to resort to the economic domination of peoples.

85. A number of small Territories which still do not have autonomy continue to live under a system of colonial subjugation and are used for military purposes by the imperialist States, which seek to establish military bases there in order to safeguard the strategic and military interests of the colonialist States. The colonialist States, in particular the United States, use every means to delay the liquidation of colonialism in those Territories. They seek to preserve their military interests there, under the guise of various forms of domination—such as "free participation" or "political confederation"—which in fact are nothing but smoke-screens for their colonialist domination and the legitimization of their annexation of these Territories.

86. The United States Administration seeks by every possible means to exploit the region of Micronesia, which is under its trusteeship, in order to serve its own strategic and military interests. In the past, the United States Government expelled Micronesians from some of the islands and made nuclear-testing grounds out of the islands of Bikini and Eniwetok. Thus, several generations of Micronesians will suffer from the effects of this forced relocation and environmental pollution.

87. Apparently, after four decades of United States trusteeship over that region, the State exercising the trusteeship cannot demonstrate that it has made it possible for the people of the Territory to build a free and autonomous economy that could meet its needs. And after four decades the inhabitants of that region are still unable to achieve political, economic, social and educational progress and finally to accede to independence and autonomy.

88. The increase in United States military activities in Micronesia; the efforts the United States is making to obtain future military privileges through its military presence in the islands; the long-term military conventions and agreements it imposes on the Territory to enable the Pentagon to maintain testing grounds for missiles and strategic naval bases and airfields there; and the setting up of repositories for nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction—all this proves that the United States is violating its basic trusteeship mandate, which is designed to strengthen international peace and security, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

89. United States military measures in Micronesia are a source of concern and disquiet. Indeed, not only is Micronesia being turned into a colonized satellite State and a military-strategic bridgehead, but these military manoeuvres and measures are a denial of the Micronesian people's right to freedom.

90. Recourse to contrived kinds of freedom is a neo-colonialist method. "Free confederation" and "constructive participation" are merely illegal procedures and pretexts which demonstrate that the United States is determined to disregard the will of the Micronesians. This constitutes a challenge to the wish of the international community to put an end to colonial methods.

91. During the 85th meeting yesterday, we heard a statement by the United States representative, whose culture and diplomatic skill we respect. We would have expected such a respected spokesman to be better informed about the history of decolonization and the work of the Special Committee. We were astonished to hear that representative trying to rewrite history according to his lights, and even to rewrite the Committee's report. We heard his oversimplification of objective facts, his attribution to the Committee of words never spoken there, the irony with which he spoke of the Committee's achievements, his deliberate disregard for the peoples' sacrifices and the thousands of martyrs who fell for the freedom of their homelands, victims of colonialist arrogance, his attempts to discredit the General Assembly and belittle the progress towards decolonization and the contempt and mockery directed at the Assembly. His lack of a sense of humour has put him in an unenviable position. He showed great indifference to human suffering. To hear this from a civilized man is of course astonishing, but to hear it from the representative of a régime that has adopted arrogance and unlimited force as the single principle governing international relations is not at all astonishing.

92. This reminds me of the story of a humourist about a deaf and mute Martian who visits the Earth every 25 years and cannot understand what concerns people there. I do not think that the comments of that Martian could be more surprising than those made by the United States representative.

93. The United States representative spoke of a number of things that have nothing to do with the question before the Assembly. He referred in an unfriendly, inappropriate and impertinent manner to some States that have just acceded to independence. Moreover, he deliberately disregarded the colonial situation in South Africa and the tragedy of 20 million Africans. He disregarded the problem of Namibia as well as that of the 4 million Palestinians who are struggling to exercise their inalienable right to independence and freedom. He also neglected to mention that his Government has not recognized the General Assembly's authority to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibian territory, and thus it still recognizes the legitimacy of the Pretoria régime's authority there. He did not note that his Government has not recognized the General Assembly's authority to establish the United Nations Council for Namibia, nor, consequently, the authority of that Council to enact Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[1] The United States Government has continued to give the racist Pretoria régime political and diplomatic protection and prevents the Security Council from imposing

comprehensive sanctions to compel it to respect international legitimacy. It does so knowing full well the intentions of the Pretoria régime and the effects of its support on the situation in southern Africa.

94. The United States representative has disregarded the fact that his Government considers the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, and the struggle of the people of South Africa, led by its liberation movement, to be terrorism. He has also ignored the fact that the policy of constructive engagement applied by his Government in relations with the racist régime strengthens South Africa's intransigence and defiance of the international community. He has deliberately disregarded the fact that the all-out assistance given by his Government to the racist régime is mainly responsible for the fact that South Africa is continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and for the sufferings of the Namibian people.

95. In the Fourth Committee the same representative spoke of the difference between resolutions and solutions and the ways of arriving at them. Frankly, I do not disagree with that analysis and I should like to state here that in the Special Committee we never mistake solutions for resolutions. We know very well when resolutions are contributing to solutions, and when they are one sign of the impatience of the international community with manoeuvres, delaying tactics, trickery and other means used by colonial authorities when all means of achieving understanding, dialogue and compromise have been exhausted. When there is strong language in resolutions it reflects negative positions and negative circumstances. That language is aimed at touching the conscience of those who give their own selfish interest precedence over the right of peoples to live in dignity and freedom, and it constitutes a warning.

96. The representative of the United States claims that it is the supporters of the cold war who raise the question of Puerto Rico in the Special Committee and that the Committee is not qualified to consider the question since that territory . . .

97. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

98. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I did not realize that I was on the agenda for this meeting. Would you please determine whether I am and, if I am not, would you ask the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to confine himself to the agenda for the meeting.

99. The PRESIDENT: I ask the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to continue, bearing in mind the statement of the representative of the United States.

100. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I hope that the representative of the United States understands that I am responding to his statement and not to him personally. I said a few moments ago, as part of my statement, that I respect him, appreciate his knowledge of the subject and respect his diplomatic skill. But in the context of a response to points he raised in his statement yesterday I do not believe—speaking objectively—that I have gone beyond the scope of the item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

101. The representative of the United States claimed in his statement yesterday that it is those who support cold war in the Special Committee who raise and support consideration of the question of Puerto Rico in the Committee, and that the Committee is not competent to consider the question of Puerto Rico since it is no longer on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 748 (VIII), which recognizes that the people of Puerto Rico has exercised its right to self-determination. In order to analyse that claim, I wish to state the following.

102. First, the fact that Puerto Rico is no longer on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, in keeping with resolution 748 (VIII), does not mean that the Special Committee cannot legally consider the question of Puerto Rico, because the mandate entrusted to the Special Committee, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV), confers upon it the right, and empowers it, to consider all situations existing in all Non-Self-Governing Territories, in keeping with the Declaration.

103. Secondly, the sole purpose of the referendum which the United States organized in Puerto Rico in March 1952, so that it could claim that the people of Puerto Rico had already exercised its right to self-determination, was to distort the will of the people of Puerto Rico and not allow it to express its opinion freely. On the one hand, that referendum asked the people of Puerto Rico to vote "yes" or "no" to the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, without any other alternative. Furthermore, that referendum took place after the then President of the United States, Truman, had rescinded the law adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico in January 1946 which claimed the right to a referendum so that the people of Puerto Rico could freely express its desire to be independent or to be associated with the United States.

104. Thirdly, assuming that the referendum—a referendum which took place under the shadow of the colonial administration—was valid, the United States has not respected the text of resolution 748 (VIII), to which it has had recourse to prevent the General Assembly and the international community from considering the question of Puerto Rico. Paragraph 9 of that resolution states that the will of both the Puerto Rican and American peoples must be taken into account if there is a desire to modify the clauses linking them together. The behaviour of the United States since that date has been progressively more negative in terms of allowing the people of Puerto Rico to achieve self-government. That is a standing violation of the Constitution of Puerto Rico. I will quote what has been said by Puerto Rican petitioners in the Special Committee:

> "Puerto Rico continues to be colonized. Every day Puerto Rico is further from self-government, because the so-called free association between the United States of America and Puerto Rico is in fact nothing but the free association that could exist between a shark and a sardine."

I can also quote another petitioner, who said that that situation is in fact the imposition of the will of a strong country on a weak people and country, and that the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico is nothing if it is not colonialist.

105. Everything I have said shows that the argument that resolution 748 (VIII) prevents the Special Committee from considering the situation in Puerto Rico has no legal or factual grounds, and paragraph 9 of that resolution grants the people of Puerto Rico the right to change that situation and to modify the

agreement under which it is associated with the United States. I wonder how we in the Special Committee could shut our ears to the frank and unanimous call of the people of Puerto Rico to change their colonial situation at a time when the Committee has seen, for several consecutive years, a political manifestation expressing the collective desire of the people of Puerto Rico that the question of Puerto Rico be considered as an independent item in the General Assembly. Fortunately the records of that Committee exist, and the United States representative can look them up. I wonder how the international community could hesitate to provide total support for the people of Puerto Rico.

106. I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing our deep concern over the present policy of the United States, which uses the territory of Puerto Rico as a forward military base and uses it to implement its policy of aggression in Latin America. We condemn that policy, which constitutes a very serious challenge to the sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico and its will to live in peace. The United States has imposed on the people of Puerto Rico service in the American armed forces, forcing them to participate in wars with which they are not concerned. Furthermore, Puerto Rico is exploited for the military and strategic interests of the United States and also for the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, without any consideration being given to the will of the people of Puerto Rico or its interests and security. After all this, it is truly surprising that the representative of the United States reaches the conclusion that those who support the cold war are responsible for including the question of Puerto Rico on the agenda of the Special Committee.

107. At this time when the United Nations is trying to bring to a final end the last manifestations of colonialism, it is our duty to raise our voices against new attempts being made in certain regions of the world to return to the policy of imperialistic interests, to threaten the independence and freedom of States and to interfere in their internal affairs, under new slogans, and attempts to establish new military bases and carry out plans which would again place our countries and peoples under colonial domination or within zones of influence or would draw them into armed confrontation. The announcement of the creation of "rapid deployment forces" and the concept of "strategic balance" represent nothing but a new and hideous phase of the new wave of neo-imperialism against the independence of our peoples, our national dignity, our rights over our national wealth and our sovereignty. This means that the complete implementation of the Declaration continues to be a fundamental issue, which compels us to step up our efforts, particularly in the Special Committee, so as to complete our sacred task.

108. The struggle of the Syrian Arab Republic against colonialism and racism finds inspiration in our belief in the unity of the cause of freedom and our belief that we are on the front line of confrontation with mankind's common enemy. Whether it be *apartheid*, zionism, imperialism or colonialism, the enemy is one, and its persistence in aggression and challenge imposes upon us duties and responsibilities which we shall accept without hesitation so as to overthrow all régimes of oppression and colonialism and racism to bring about order and freedom for the benefit of all peoples.

109. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): The age of modern colonialism began about 1500, following European discoveries of a sea route around Africa's southern coast, in 1488, and of America, in 1492. With these events sea power shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic and to the emerging nation-States such as Portugal, Spain and England. By so-called discovery, conquest and settlement, these nations expanded and colonized others wherever possible throughout the world, spreading their institutions and cultures.

110. In the first post-war years there were some prospects that, except in the case of the Indian subcontinent, decolonization might come gradually and on terms favourable to the colonial Powers at the time. After the French defeat in Indo-China in 1954 and the abortive Anglo-French Suez expedition of 1956, however, decolonization took on an irresistible momentum, so that by the mid-1970s only scattered vestiges of colonial Territories remained.

111. The reasons for this accelerated decolonization process were as follows. First, the two post-war super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, took a common position against colonialism, and we are grateful that at least on that occasion they were able to act in unity. Secondly, the mass revolutionary movements of the colonial world fought colonial wars which were far too expensive and bloody. Thirdly, the war-weary public of Europe eventually refused any further sacrifices to maintain overseas colonies.

112. In general, those colonies which offered neither concentrated economic resources nor strategic advantages and/or additional homes for the colonial settlers won easy separation, with self-determination and independence, from their colonial overlords. The others struggled along the long, difficult and frustrating road to self-determination and independence. Namibia has been walking along that road for as long as the United Nations has been concerned with decolonization, since its inception in 1945. However, there is hope. This hope is in our dream that one day in the very near future colonialism, together with racism and *apartheid*, will be totally eradicated from the face of our planet, Earth. The United Nations and the world community must act together and urgently in harmony. The plight of the Namibian people must continue to engage our most serious attention.

113. In line with our dream of universality in the membership of the United Nations, we are all happy to see the former British colony of Brunei Darussalam become a sovereign independent State which is already contributing effectively to helping others in the world.

114. The decision by the Cocos (Keeling) Islanders to integrate with Australia is yet another step towards the total eradication of colonialism.

115. We are all thankful for the important work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization. Papua New Guinea government representatives have stressed, both here in the United Nations and in other international forums, the important role the United Nations has been playing in the field of decolonization. Many of us Member States represented here in this Hall owe our emergence as independent sovereign nations to the decisive role played by the United Nations.

116. The process of decolonization was greatly hastened by the historic Declaration adopted in 1960 by the United Nations. The process was further accelerated by the work of the Special Committee, which was set up in the following year. I am proud to note that the Committee is chaired by Mr. Koroma, and I have every confidence that under his able guidance the remaining Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories will soon make their choice and, perhaps, join us in this community of nations.

117. Whilst the remaining dependent Territories are but a handful, my delegation believes that complacency must have no place in the endeavours of the United Nations in the area of decolonization. It is still our obligation as Members of the United Nations to facilitate the work of both the Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee in affording the peoples of these Territories the right of self-determination and independence.

118. Without detracting in any way from the intrinsic importance of other issues pertaining to this item, I propose to focus on dependent Territories in the Pacific.

119. The implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples continues to be an important undertaking, with regard to which Papua New Guinea's resolve has not diminished. Our seeking of membership in the Special Committee is in line with the priority the Papua New Guinea Government gives to decolonization. We are realistic about our influence in the world Organization and, indeed, about our ability to effect changes in the decolonization process. In comparison with the United States or the Soviet Union our influence and our ability to effect changes are very minute. But we have not allowed, and we shall continue not to allow, that realism to degenerate into cynical indifference.

120. Papua New Guinea continues to believe that the peoples of small Territories, irrespective of size, population or geographical location, have the same right to self-determination and independence as those of other Territories. Like most other States Members of the United Nations, Papua New Guinea attaches great importance also to the continuing dispatch of United Nations visiting missions to colonial Territories. Papua New Guinea has been very fortunate in having participated in two of these missions. We congratulate the administering Powers concerned for continuing to extend invitations and permit access by such missions to their dependent Territories.

121. Like other independent Pacific island countries, Papua New Guinea is particularly concerned with the remaining dependent Territories of the Pacific region. When he addressed the Assembly during the general debate, on 1 October 1984, the Foreign Minister of Papua New Guinea stated that:

> "Successive Papua New Guinea Governments have taken a particular interest in developments in the French Territories—New Caledonia, French Polynesia and Wallis and Futuna—and in the last of the United Nations trust territories—the United States Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands . . . New Caledonia has been of special concern to us, and to the Governments of the South Pacific Forum." [*See 15th meeting, para. 351.*]

122. It is with a deep sense of regret that I draw the Assembly's attention to the unenviable situation which has existed in New Caledonia since 18 November 1984. Papua New Guinea is well aware that no standard decolonization model can be conceived and applied to any of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, including New Caledonia, for the purpose of ending colonial rule in those Territories. Indeed, Papua New Guinea and, for that matter, other members of the South Pacific Forum have accepted a variety of models and outcomes of decolonization. A recent example is our acceptance of the decision by the Cocos (Keeling) Islanders to integrate with Australia.

123. Despite the slow and very protracted progress being made towards the decolonization of New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, along with the other countries of the Pacific region, has never relented in its commitment to finding a political programme which will enable the peaceful transition of New Caledonia to independence. We drafted our communiqués on the issue of New Caledonia with great patience and caution, and with a lot of sensitivity and good will towards all parties concerned. The communiqué issued at the August meeting of the Forum, in Tuvalu, attests to this.

124. At the Forum meeting in Tuvalu my Government, with the other Forum Governments, noted with some degree of satisfaction the constitutional and electoral reforms approved in May by the French Parliament, especially those which lend themselves to the possibility of eventual independence. But we also stated that we could not see why a referendum on the issues could not be held before 1989. The Forum also recommended that the French Government make a public statement describing independence as "the desirable, logical and acknowledged outcome" of the scheduled referendum. Papua New Guinea subscribed to this because it held out the possibility of quelling the frustration and passions of the independence movement in New Caledonia. Regrettably, the administering Power only indicated a willingness to move up the planned 1989 referendum after the abortive elections of 18 November and the civil disturbances that resulted from them.

125. In this respect, my Government is pleased to note that the administering Power is doing all it can to achieve peace and maintain order in the Territory of New Caledonia. My Government is pleased too that the French Government has appointed a special representative and High Commissioner for New Caledonia, Mr. Edgard Pisani, with specific terms of reference to restore order, develop dialogue among political groups and prepare the Territory for the eventual act of self-determination and independence. We understand that the French cabinet has charged Mr. Pisani with proposing to the Government within two months, and then implementing, measures concerning the institutional evolution and the economic, social and cultural development of New Caledonia, as well as the modalities for the exercise of the right to self-determination.

126. The political developments surrounding the territorial assembly elections of 18 November have been a cause of serious concern to my Government. Of particular concern are the election results, which seem not to be representative of all the people of New Caledonia. Information available to us indicates that less than 50 per cent of the estimated 140,000 population of New Caledonia participated in the 18

November election and that most Melanesians, who are the original inhabitants of New Caledonia—the Kanaks—did not participate in the elections.

127. After Canada and the Soviet Union, New Caledonia is the third largest supplier of nickel, estimated at about 15 per cent of the world total. But, as in all colonial Territories, the ownership of the nickel industry is mainly in the hands of foreign investors, and it is presumed that the nickel reserves in New Caledonia have only about 10 to 12 years of life left. One can therefore understand, perhaps, why the Kanaks want to be independent before 1989. New Caledonia also has other mineral reserves, such as chrome, manganese, cobalt and copper, which are important for high-technology industries.

128. The historical, social and political evolution of New Caledonia has resulted in the Kanak people's being put at a disadvantage within the political sphere. One can therefore understand, perhaps, why the Kanaks want electoral reforms, which the Government of Papua New Guinea endorses, to redress this anomaly in any act of self-determination.

129. Yet another legacy of colonial rule in New Caledonia was the alienation of land from its traditional owners. The French took possession of most of the land and reallocated it to French and other European settlers. They confined the Kanaks to reservations, which today account for less than 20 per cent of the total land area, approximately.

130. The wish of the Kanaks and other people of New Caledonia to be independent must be seen against that background. It is our fervent hope that France, with the Kanaks and all the other parties concerned, will be able to work out an acceptable solution to the situation in New Caledonia. Papua New Guinea congratulates the French Government on its very recent actions, which are positive.

131. Papua New Guinea's concern for the elimination of the remaining vestiges of colonialism in the Pacific region also extends to the growing connection which seems to pertain between the colonial and nuclear policies of certain Powers. These, I am afraid, cannot be separated in our policies in the Pacific. That contention would once have seemed abstract and remote to Papua New Guinea but, regrettably, it has become quite evident that certain Powers which have Territories in the region regard their presence there as authority to carry out a nuclear testing programme, despite opposition from the peoples and Governments of the region.

132. Also, Papua New Guinea will not condone attempts to override or bypass the provision in the Palauan Constitution which outlaws the entry of nuclear weapons to Palau.

133. The exercise by the Marshall Islanders and the Federated States of Micronesia of their right of self-determination is encouraging to our Governments. It is our hope that the United States Congress will soon formalize those agreements and compacts.

134. We hope also that Palau will exercise its right of self-determination, early in 1985. To that end we urge both the administering Authority and the people of Palau to finalize consideration of an appropriate compact of free association and request the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council to determine the disengagement of the trusteeship agreement that we have now.

135. Turning to the northwestern part of the African continent, Papua New Guinea continues to follow with great admiration the unrelenting efforts of the OAU and the United Nations to find a peaceful and workable solution to the plight of the people of the Western Sahara. Papua New Guinea therefore exhorts all parties to the conflict to co-operate with both the OAU and the United Nations in their endeavours.

136. Regarding the South Atlantic, we note with much regret the inability of Argentina and Great Britain to reach an acceptable settlement of their conflict over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). It is perhaps pertinent to remind both parties that in their search for an acceptable solution of the problem they should always bear in mind that they have an obligation to ensure that the inalienable rights, interests, wishes and well-being of the people of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) remain paramount in their considerations. We wish to express the hope that to that end a dialogue between the two Governments will be resumed as soon as possible.

137. I thank the Chairman of the Special Committee for the distinguished work he has carried out and I thank the delegations represented here for the power that they have exercised in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

138. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of France on a point of order.

139. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation would like to remind the Assembly that New Caledonia is not on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Therefore it is not on the agenda of the General Assembly under item 18 and should not be referred to in statements made by delegations taking part in this debate. It was through courtesy that my delegation did not request that the last speaker be prevented from expressing himself as he did. However, it is our hope that members of the Assembly will abide by the established agenda. For its part, the French delegation intends to respect the rules of procedure and therefore will not reply to the substance of the statement.

140. On the other hand, the French delegation is entirely open to a full and frank dialogue with all delegations which seek it. The meeting last October between the Minister of State responsible for overseas departments and Territories and the representatives in New York of the States of the South Pacific bore witness to this. It was in the same spirit that the French delegation informed those representatives of the region of steps recently taken by the French Government in connection with the institutional evolution and the economic, social and cultural development of the Territory, as well as the ways and means for the exercise of the right to self-determination, and emphasized the importance of the next two months for the task which has been entrusted to Mr. Pisani. I would also mention in passing—although, I say again, this item is not on the agenda—that the representative of Papua New Guinea himself acknowledged the importance and scope of the steps taken recently by the French Government.

141. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Next year will mark a quarter of a century since the General Assembly, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

which solemnly proclaimed "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

142. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR believes that in this connection it is appropriate to recall those events of epoch-making significance in the development of mankind which not only led to the recognition and consolidation in international relations of the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence, but also gave a practical dimension to the question of securing its immediate and now almost universal implementation.

143. I refer first of all to the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, which was a guiding star before the broad movement of all oppressed peoples to destroy all forms of colonial domination. The State of workers and peasants to which that Revolution gave birth ushered in the era of social renewal in the world, as well as social justice and the downfall of the system of colonial oppression and enslavement of peoples. Soviet Russia was the sole great Power, as long ago as 1919, which refused to recognize the mandate system of the League of Nations which in essence amounted to handing out mandates for the pillaging and plundering of foreign territories.

144. Thereafter there was the victorious culmination of the unprecedentedly widespread and bitter struggle of peoples against the forces of fascism athirst for world domination, a victory whose fortieth anniversary will be commemorated by all progressive mankind next spring. For the peoples of the Soviet Union, this was a just war of liberation in which they made their own decisive contribution in gaining victory over Hitler's fascism. This mighty victory for all peace-loving peoples was won not only over the forces of militarism and aggression, but also over the misanthropic policies and doctrines of racism. It had a tremendous impact on the unprecedented growth of the national liberation struggle of colonial and dependent peoples against alien domination.

145. A powerful moral and political incentive which hastened the dissolution of the colonial system of imperialism was the initiative of the Soviet Union, which in 1960 put forward in the United Nations a programme for the complete elimination of colonialism and racism on Earth, which formed the foundation for the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

146. Since then, primarily as a result of the powerful national liberation movement of peoples and the relentless efforts of the United Nations to tackle the problems of decolonization, considerable success has been achieved. Hundreds of millions of people have thrown off the shackles of colonial oppression, and on the political map of the world dozens of new independent States have appeared. They are making a substantial contribution to tackling the vital problems of the present day.

147. At the same time, this backdrop of clear and inspiring results in efforts to eliminate the colonial enslavement of peoples throws into correspondingly glaring relief the remnants of this shameful phenomenon of our times, which serves as a stark reminder that the process of implementing the Declaration has not yet been completed.

148. For many years now, southern Africa has been one of the major "hot spots" on the planet, a region where the widest focus of colonialism and racism in its most repugnant form, *apartheid*, persists. The colonial-racist régime of South Africa continues grossly and high-handedly to flout the rights of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa to self-determination, as well as their aspirations to freedom and independence. In an attempt to perpetuate their own existence, the racists have promoted to the rank of State policy all-out terrorism and violence against the indigenous African population, including mass arrests, cruel torture and murder of national liberation fighters. This stamping-ground of colonialism and racism is not only the source of suffering for millions of people and an affront to human dignity and to the cause of elementary rights of which peoples under racism and oppression are being deprived, but also poisons and aggravates the overall international situation, thus representing a threat to the entire African continent as well as to international peace and security.

149. Outright foreign domination continues to prevail in a number of so-called small dependent and Trust Territories situated in the vast spaces of the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans, as well as in the Caribbean. The main obstacles impeding the way to the complete and final elimination of the system of colonial oppression in southern Africa and in colonial and dependent Territories are well known.

150. The United Nations archives contain a number of profound and very thorough studies which quite clearly indicate that one of the fundamental reasons for its resolutions not having been implemented in this area is the fact that the Western Powers, primarily the United States and other NATO members, are doing everything they can to counter and resist any change in the status of colonial and dependent Territories because the perpetuation of colonialism and racism in various parts of the world is in keeping with their own economic and military-strategic interests.

151. It has long been established and proved that a colonial régime in such Territories provides the monopolies of those countries with exclusively favourable conditions for them to extract fabulous profits by the unhindered pillaging and depletion of non-renewable natural resources and inhuman exploitation of the local population. In their turn, the economic, financial and other circles, acting as direct accomplices of the colonial régimes, are the most active practitioners of a global policy of imperialism aimed at converting colonial, Trust and dependent Territories into "military strongholds", "bridges" and "beach-heads" on the approaches to independent countries and continents.

152. The desire of foreign monopolies to preserve the sources of their super-profits in southern Africa significantly determines the position of Western countries with regard to the whole range of decolonization issues relating to that area. This takes the form, *inter alia*, of delaying tactics and manoeuvres in the question of a Namibian settlement on the basis of the Security Council resolutions and of attempts to attach such conditions to its solution as would leave a free hand for foreign capital to continue exploiting this country in the future. This is precisely the way in which the imperialist circles in Western countries interpret a so-called peaceful solution to the problems of colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination, about which we hear so much from their representatives here in the United Nations. This is

borne out by the present discussion on the question of Namibia.

153. A particular sphere of unimpeded domination by the imperialist monopolies is that of the so-called small colonial and Trust Territories. As indicated in United Nations documentation on the situation in those Territories, foreign monopolies exercise virtually complete control over the exploitation of the natural and human resources there for their own benefit and are not one whit concerned over the future and well-being of the indigenous population. Their entire so-called beneficial activity is subordinated to stunting the growth of the national awareness of those peoples and impeding implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

154. We should not be misled by the Pharisaical utterances of representatives of colonial Powers, including those who spoke in today's meeting, that their monopolies bring some good to the small colonial and dependent Territories. All these are fairy tales, but fairy tales that are by no means harmless ones. Dozens of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America that have won their political independence in the recent past have not yet been able to free themselves from the clutches of foreign State monopolistic capital.

155. It is well known that in a number of instances the administering Powers have tried to use the extremely difficult economic situation in the Trust Territories to impose on them and perpetuate new forms of colonial dependency under the labels of "association", "commonwealth" and various types of "integration". This is particularly true of Micronesia, an analysis of whose situation might also serve as a response to those who are quick to take offence because "the United Nations fails to understand the significance of the alleged beneficial mission of foreign monopolies in Non-Self-Governing Territories".

156. Approximately four decades ago the United States received the mandate to administer the Trust Territory of Micronesia, in order, as the Charter of the United Nations says in Article 76, paragraph b: "to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence". I should like to emphasize those last words—"self-government or independence". In the interim the United States has not only failed to create an independent and viable economy in that Territory but is in fact doing everything to turn it into its own neo-colonialist appendage.

157. In this connection, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR would like to reiterate that a solution to the question of Micronesia's future is part and parcel of the overall problem of decolonization and the question of granting colonial countries and peoples their right to self-determination and independence. According to the Charter, any alteration in Micronesia's status as a Trust Territory can be carried out solely by decision of the Security Council. No unilateral action by administering Powers in Trust Territories or individual components thereof can be considered proper or as having legal force.

158. The ongoing colonial exploitation of small Territories by imperialist monopolies and their use by the administering Powers as military bases are extremely serious obstacles to the achievement by the populations of those Territories of self-determination and independence and to the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration.

159. The establishment of military bases in Guam, Puerto Rico, Micronesia, Diego Garcia, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands and other colonial and dependent Territories is by no means intended simply to provide more jobs for the local population, as the colonizers have asserted. Those bases are strongholds for the suppression of national liberation movements and to enable the colonial Powers to maintain a military presence, and such actions run counter to the cause of international peace and security.

160. A great deal has been done and a number of positive results have been achieved in implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, the United Nations must exert new efforts to ensure the speedy and complete achievement of the final goals of decolonization and to implement its historic resolution 1514 (XV), which contains that Declaration.

161. In conclusion, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR must emphasize that the historic Declaration should be fully implemented. We support the programme which has been prepared by the Special Committee in connection with the twenty-fifth anniversary of its adoption, and we believe that if it is acted upon this will help to promote the further mobilization of United Nations efforts and, indeed, the efforts of the entire international community to struggle for the final culmination of the decolonization process.

162. With regard to today's misplaced—not to say provocative—remarks by the representative of the United Kingdom, in which he referred to the Byelorussian SSR, we recommend that he re-read the beginning of his statement, particularly that part of it which said that the question of independence should be resolved by the peoples themselves. I should like to believe that he was being sincere. I would remind him that the Byelorussian people, as far as its freedom and independence are concerned, decided the matter fully and finally in the period of the Great October Socialist Revolution and proved the correctness of its choice in the years of the Second World War in the struggle against fascism. He could satisfy his pathological interest by reading at leisure the relevant part of any elementary course in history.

163. Mr. ADDABASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): When we meet next year to consider this item a quarter of a century will have passed since the adoption in 1960 by the General Assembly of resolution 1514 (XV), which contains the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This was a significant step in strengthening the struggle of colonial peoples and speeding up the decolonization process. That Declaration, as a premise from which the United Nations has proceeded to act in the area of decolonization, was reaffirmed in December 1980 in resolution 35/118, to which is annexed the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

164. Since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), we have witnessed the growth of the liberation

movement and the reduction of the scope of colonialism through the accession of many countries to independence, the latest of which was Brunei Darussalam, which we have congratulated on its independence and welcomed to membership of the United Nations. While expressing our gratification for the achievements in the sphere of decolonization, we should not forget that the ultimate goal of resolution 1514 (XV), world-wide decolonization, has not yet been achieved. We believe that the reasons for this are the following.

165. The first is the activities of foreign economic interests. The colonial States encourage their transnational corporations to invest in colonial Territories, which leads to the control of those Territories by foreign corporations, the plunder of their resources and the exploitation of the cheap labour available. The profits are then repatriated to their countries of origin, which have come to consider the activities of transnational corporations in the colonial Territories an integral part of their economy. Their main objective, therefore, is to preserve their interests in the colonial Territories and to delay the independence of those Territories in order to continue to pillage their resources. There are now about 1,000 corporations operating in colonial Territories.

166. Secondly, there are military bases and installations of colonial States in the Territories under their administration, such as the bases and installations in Guam, Puerto Rico and Micronesia. There is no doubt that such bases and installations represent a sword hanging over the colonial peoples that prevents them from freely expressing their wishes and demanding the right to self-determination and independence.

167. Thirdly, there is the abuse of the right of veto in the Security Council, where we see the colonial Powers having recourse to the right of veto against any draft resolution not in keeping with their interests. Consequently, they oppose any draft resolution that would help the colonial peoples to attain their right to self-determination and independence, if they think that it is against their interests, regardless of the international community's point of view. We have seen ample evidence of this as, for example, when the Security Council was seized of the question of Namibia.

168. All of these reasons taken together have impeded the process of decolonization, resulting in the fact that a certain number of peoples are still oppressed and denied their freedom. The peoples of Namibia, South Africa and Palestine are foremost among those still striving against imperialism, racism and zionism.

169. In Africa, the Namibian people is still struggling to achieve its independence and its right to self-determination, despite all the efforts exerted by the international community, as well as the initiatives of the Secretary-General aimed at implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This is the result of the intransigence of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa in its persistence in illegally occupying Namibia. It is crystal clear that the *apartheid* régime has used the negotiations conducted in the past few years to gain time and delay the implementation of that resolution by resorting to flimsy pretexts and prevarications, as well as manoeuvres aimed at diverting attention from the essence of the problem and impeding Namibia's accession to independence. Their latest manoeuvre was to inject a new element which is totally extraneous to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia: the linkage of independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, a matter considered as interference in the internal affairs of Angola that has been condemned by the international community. There is no doubt that South Africa is also trying to perpetuate the internal solution and sidestep SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, through the installation of a puppet régime in Namibia nurturing its interests as well as those of the colonial Powers that encourage the régime to persist in such a policy by providing it with assistance of all kinds. Hence South Africa has flouted the will of the international community and continued to occupy Namibia and part of the territory of Angola.

170. As for South Africa itself, the black citizens are still struggling to attain majority rule and eliminate the abhorrent system of *apartheid*. They expect increased assistance from the international community to secure their fundamental rights.

171. Lately, the racist régime has resorted to new methods to reinforce its policy through the establishment of a sham bicameral parliament for the Coloureds and those of Asian origins in an effort to spread disunion among various groups of people, and through the recruitment of Asians and Coloureds, using them in acts of suppression against their black brothers. The international community has not been deceived by this ploy. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council have rejected this attempt and have underlined the fact that the policy of *apartheid* is irreparable and should be eliminated altogether.

172. On this occasion the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya confirms that it is necessary to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime in South Africa in order to compel it to abandon its policy of *apartheid* and put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia, thus enabling the peoples of the two territories to regain their rights to self-determination and independence.

173. Many other peoples are still struggling to attain independence and self-determination. The Palestinian people heads this list. This people is still displaced, leading a tragic life after its expulsion from its territory. So far, the United Nations has not been able to help it regain its right to self-determination, recover its territory and establish its own independent State, like the other peoples of the world.

174. Equally, the people of Puerto Rico is still struggling for its right to self-determination and decolonization. Its cause was the subject of lengthy debates by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in respect of which many resolutions were adopted, all affirming the right of this Territory to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

175. Many other Territories all over the world are still colonized. In particular, I wish to address the subject of the Malvinas. Colonialism there should be eliminated and Argentine sovereignty upheld. The Comorian island of Mayotte should be restored to the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros. The military base on Diego Garcia should be dismantled

and the Territory should be restored to Mauritius and its population returned to the island.

176. The administering Powers should safeguard the interests of the colonial Territories and their right to self-determination. The United States should also safeguard the interests of the peoples of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and abide by their wishes. It should ensure the return of the population of Bikini to their island as soon as possible.

177. My delegation sincerely hopes that the efforts of the United Nations will soon be crowned with success. Those efforts are aimed at the speedy elimination of colonialism in all its traditional manifestations, such as the occupation of Territories, the domination of peoples, the usurping of their freedoms and the exploiting of their riches. The Organization could then apply itself to combating neocolonialism as embodied in political hegemony and in the imposition of economic and cultural dependence on weaker States and peoples—a practice that in recent years has widened in scope.

178. We have also recently witnessed neo-colonial aspirations to restore colonialism in and control over a number of small independent and non-aligned countries. Furthermore, there have been acts of military provocation and economic blackmail and threats of force by the big imperialist States against small countries, so as to intimidate them and undermine their development, impose economic hegemony over them and tie them to the wheel of colonialism. Last year one imperialist State occupied a small State, toppled its Government and placed it under its direct control.

179. The United Nations still has a long and arduous road before it in the area of decolonization. It must see to it that all necessary measures are taken in order to compel the colonialists who usurp the territories and the rights of peoples to withdraw from those territories and to respect the will of the peoples and their desire for self-determination and freedom.

180. The international community must remain vigilant with regard to the *modus operandi* of certain colonial States. The greater the pressure of international public opinion on them, the more they step up their manoeuvres allegedly aimed at a peaceful solution, in a desperate attempt to sidestep the genuine liberation movements and impose doubtful solutions that result in the installation of puppet Governments which safeguard the interests of the imperialist States and remain under their control.

181. The commitment of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the cause of liberation and decolonization speaks for itself. That commitment stems from the conviction of the Libyan people that its freedom will not be complete as long as some peoples still languish under colonialism and racism and are denied their fundamental rights. My country stands by those colonial peoples in their struggle. We shall continue to give them material and moral support of all kinds until all the peoples gain their freedom, until their rights are restored in full and until the age of colonialism ends once and for all.

182. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to commend the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and its Chairman, Mr. Koroma of Sierra Leone, for the efforts they have made to speed up the decolonization process. We confirm our absolute support of its recommendations.

183. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speakers for this morning. I shall now call those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

184. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I was pleased, though a bit surprised, a few moments ago to hear the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic explain that he was not attacking me at all. It was a bit hard to tell the difference, particularly when he referred to statements I had made as "contemptible", "distorted", "impertinent", "ignorant" and so on. However, I shall let that pass simply with the observation that it is often as fortunate to be known by one's enemies as by one's friends.

185. I was struck, of course, by his repeated attempt to drag Puerto Rico on to our agenda. Of course, it is not on the agenda but, nevertheless, he touched my heart when he expressed such deep concern for what he termed the destruction of Puerto Rican culture and the Puerto Rican people. I am sure the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic is not in the habit of riding the New York City subways—I am quite sure he travels about by limousine—but were he ever to take the subways he would see that all of the public signs there are in Spanish, as well as in English, and that New York City has a very extensive programme of bilingual Spanish-English education. That is in New York, not in Puerto Rico. Of course, Spanish remains the language of Puerto Rico. So much for the destruction of Puerto Rican culture.

186. As far as the Puerto Rican polity is concerned, I think we all know that there are elections there every four years. There were elections there for Governor at the beginning of November, and the Puerto Rican Independence Party, as it does every four years, contested those elections. Normally it receives about 6 per cent of the vote; this time it received a little under 4 per cent.

187. Now, as I have said, Puerto Rico is not on the agenda and I do not think it is proper or—if I may use a sexist term—manly to drag it in by the back door. If the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to place Puerto Rico on the agenda, I suggest he call for a meeting of the General Committee and we will debate his proposition, but until that happens I have to insist that it is not on the agenda.

188. I cannot forbear, however, to note his remark that force is the principle of the régime for which I spoke. That in itself was rather amusing. Of course, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic is the representative of a Government which seems to be interested in the freedom of all peoples other than its own and, when it comes to force, I wonder if he would enlighten us about the circumstances which surrounded the destruction by artillery of the Syrian city of Hama, undertaken by the Syrian Arab Government, in which I understand somewhere between 10,000 and 50,000 people perished?

189. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): I would like to mention three small points, small because, as I think will be clear from my statement, there are not really any big points left for us in this annual debate.

190. The first is about the Turks and Caicos Islands, which were mentioned by a number of speakers as one of those dependent Territories in which sinister and dangerous military operations are being carried out. First, the facts, which I think are

well known, since they have been stated several times in the Committee: there was one United States officer stationed in the islands until this year but, on 29 February, he left, not to be replaced. Now we do not take the view that one officer, even an American officer, constitutes a military base, but apparently some delegations do. The representative of Bulgaria said that there had been no reaction from the administering Powers to the call from the General Assembly to close down military facilities in dependent Territories, but we have to tell him that we have closed down a base in the Turks and Caicos Islands. The representatives of the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union and Byelorussia still include the Turks and Caicos Islands in their list of dependent Territories in which military operations are going on. Perhaps they know something that we do not.

191. The second point I want to mention is the question of the armed struggle and the complaint by the representative of Bulgaria that none of the administering Powers had accepted appeals for recognition of the legitimacy of the armed struggle against colonial domination. I am glad to say that the United Kingdom does not face any such problem in any of the Territories administered by it. But I am reminded of the saying that one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist, and I would like to remind the Assembly that this emerged very clearly from the statement made in the debate on Afghanistan by the representative of the Soviet Union when he said that those States which assisted people who are resisting the occupation of Afghanistan are indulging in a policy of State terrorism. Not much recognition of the legitimacy of the armed struggle there.

192. Finally, I just want to comment on the remarks I made and the reply which was made by the representative of Byelorussia on the question of self-determination. I would like to say in all sincerity that I was in no way meaning to suggest seriously that Byelorussia should declare its independence, or something of that kind. I was making a different point. I fully accept that it is for Byelorussia to decide on its own status and future. I accept the historical explanation given to us by the representative of Byelorussia, and I accept that Byelorussia has made its choice. That is what self-determination means. In the same way it is for people in British dependent Territories to decide about their future. If they wish for independence, that is fine; if they wish for some other solution, that is fine. It is not for me, or for the representative of Byelorussia, or, indeed, for the General Assembly to try to tell them what their choice should be. That is what self-determination means.

Appointment of Members of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (Concluded)

193. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of members of the General Assembly to resolution 38/129 of 19 December 1983, whereby the Assembly decided to appoint 13 Member States as members of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law. I should like to recall that at its 67th meeting, held on 20 November, the Assembly appointed 10 members of the Advisory Committee. In this connection, I have now been informed by the Chairman of the Group of African States that that Group has endorsed the candidacies of Ghana, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Sierra Leone. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to appoint those States as members of the Advisory Committee?

It was so decided (decision 39/308).

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

87th

PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 5 December 1984,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 18

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*):

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 103

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 104

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

AGENDA ITEMS 105 AND 12

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations:

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters I and VI (section E)).

AGENDA ITEM 106

United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 107

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. INFANTE (Chile), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration six reports of the Fourth Committee relating, respectively, to agenda items 18, 103, 104, 105 and 12, 106, and 107. As these reports are self-explanatory, I shall simply point out the key elements in some of the recommendations.

2. The report on agenda item 18 is contained in document A/39/696. Paragraphs 24 to 26 of part I of the report contain 10 draft resolutions, 3 draft consensuses and 1 draft decision, and paragraph 15 of part II contains one draft resolution. The recommendations of the Fourth Committee relate to the following Territories: the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Tokelau, Pitcairn, St. Helena, American Samoa, Guam, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Montserrat, the Turks and Caicos Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, Anguilla, Gibraltar and Western Sahara.

3. Although most of these Territories are small in size and population, are geographically isolated, and have limited resources, the majority of the members of the Fourth Committee reiterated the view that

these factors should not impede in any way the exercise by the peoples of these Territories of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. According to these recommendations, the General Assembly would reaffirm the full applicability of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] with respect to the right of these peoples to determine their future political status, in accordance with the Declaration. The Assembly would also urge the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to increase their efforts to accelerate social and economic progress in the Territories.

4. In noting with appreciation the continuing co-operation of the respective administering Powers, the Assembly would emphasize once again the importance of dispatching United Nations visiting missions to these small Territories so that the United Nations can be kept fully informed of the conditions obtaining there.

5. In paragraph 24 of part I of its report, the Fourth Committee recommends that the Assembly take note of the fact that during an act of self-determination in 1984 which was observed by the United Nations Visiting Mission (*see A/39/494*), the people of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands voted by a substantial majority for integration with Australia. In view of the decision of the people of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, the transmission of information in respect of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations should cease.

6. As regards Western Sahara, the General Assembly would, *inter alia,* reaffirm that the question of Western Sahara is a question of decolonization which remains to be completed on the basis of the exercise by the people of Western Sahara of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

7. With regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, dealt with in paragraph 21 of part I of the report, the Fourth Committee decided, without objection, to adopt the Chairman's suggestion not to take any action at the current session on the draft resolution submitted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*A/39/23 (Part VI), chap XIX, para. 13*].

8. The report on item 103 is contained in document A/39/676. The Fourth Committee recommends, among other things, that the Assembly reaffirm that, in the absence of a decision by the Assembly itself to the contrary, the administering Power in question should continue to transmit information with respect to the Territory concerned.

9. The report on item 104 is contained in document A/39/663. The Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption the draft resolution contained in paragraph 11 of the report and the draft decision contained in paragraph 12. According to the draft resolution, *inter alia,* the General Assembly, condemning the intensified activities of those foreign economic, financial and other interests which continue to exploit the natural and human resources of colonial Territories, would call once again upon all Governments which have not already done so to take the necessary measures in order to put an end to such enterprises, which run counter to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories.

10. According to the draft decision the General Assembly would again call upon the colonial Powers concerned to terminate military activities in compliance with its relevant resolutions.

11. The report on items 105 and 12 is contained in document A/39/690 and Corr.1. The Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 12 of the report by which the Assembly would, *inter alia,* request the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to render or continue to render, as a matter of urgency, all possible moral and material assistance to the colonial peoples struggling for liberation from colonial rule. The General Assembly would also reiterate its conviction that the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system should refrain from taking any action which might imply recognition of, or support for, the legitimacy of the domination of the Territory by the racist régime of South Africa.

12. The report on item 106 is contained in document A/39/677. In paragraph 8 of that report, the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution. In expressing its appreciation to all those who have supported the Programme by providing contributions, scholarships or places in their educational institutions, the Assembly would once again appeal to all States, institutions, organizations and individuals to offer greater financial and other support to the Programme in order to ensure its continuation and expansion.

13. The report on item 107 is contained in document A/39/678. The Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 7 of the report. In expressing its appreciation to those Member States that have made scholarships available to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Assembly would invite all States to make or continue to make generous offers of study and training facilities to the inhabitants of these Territories.

14. As I stated at the beginning of my statement, these introductory remarks have only touched upon some of the basic elements contained in the Committee's recommendations and it should be understood that any omission is in no way a reflection of the importance or significance of the provisions concerned.

15. On behalf of the Fourth Committee, I should like to commend these reports to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

16. Before concluding, I would like to thank the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, Mr. Renagi Lohia of Papua New Guinea, for his outstanding leadership and for the constructive advice and guidance he gave me in connection with my tasks as Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee. I should also like to express my gratitude to the members of the Fourth Committee for the co-operation and assistance extended to me during the session.

17. Finally, I want to express my profound gratitude and appreciation to all the members of the secretariat of the Fourth Committee. Without their important collaboration this report would not have been possible.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee.

18. The PRESIDENT: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fourth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

19. May I remind members that in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401 the General Assembly decided that, when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. May I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote should be limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

20. We shall now take up the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 18 [*A/39/696*].

21. Mr. BENJELLOUN (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): At a time when the General Assembly is ready to take a decision on the so-called question of the Western Sahara, my delegation believes it appropriate to clarify the position of Morocco regarding draft resolution A/C.4/39/L.13.

22. Since the Organization of African Unity (OAU) took note of Morocco's decision to accept a referendum in the Sahara, numerous resolutions and decisions have been adopted by the Implementation Committee set up for that purpose which lay down in the greatest of detail the practical arrangements for such consultations.

23. Moreover, the draft resolution that has been submitted to us today disregards all the efforts made and retains only one condition—the most controversial one—which was not retained by the Implementation Committee, namely, direct negotiations between Morocco and the so-called Liberation Front.

24. That prerequisite to the holding of a referendum for self-determination, which had already brought the OAU to an impasse, in fact aims only at hampering the process begun in June 1981 and frustrates the exercise of the inalienable right to self-determination of the peoples of the Territory.

25. Concerned to create conditions likely to restore peace to the region and to provide the peoples involved with the possibility of freely expressing their choice regarding their future, Morocco submitted draft resolution A/C.4/39/L.14/Rev.1, which proposed, without any prerequisites, that the United Nations take all necessary steps to achieve a cease-fire and to organize and carry out a referendum on self-determination in the territory.

26. Unfortunately, those who do their best to thwart the efforts made to enable those peoples to express their will freely reacted negatively to that initiative by proposing amendments whose objective was to distort that draft resolution.

27. In so doing, they are merely transferring to the United Nations the contradictions inherent in the actions of those who ensured that the OAU was no longer able to carry out its mission. Refusing to back manoeuvres designed to deprive the populations of the Sahara of their right to self-determination and to divert the United Nations from its true mission, Morocco withdrew its draft resolution A/C.4/39/L.14/Rev.1.

28. For the same reasons, Morocco rejects draft resolution A/C.4/39/L.13 and, drawing attention to its negative aspects and to the true motives of its authors, invites all those whose genuine concern is to allow the populations of the territory to express their choice freely and to contribute to a speedy and just settlement of the question of Western Sahara, not to support that draft resolution.

29. Having said that, my country, which accepted the organization of a fair and equitable referendum for self-determination for the Sahara, reiterates its total readiness to engage in the immediate organization, without any prerequisites, of that referendum and renews the commitment by His Majesty King Hassan II to respect the results made to this Assembly during the thirty-eighth session.

30. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The Tunisian delegation wishes to take the opportunity offered by the General Assembly's consideration of the draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara to explain the vote it intends to cast and to recall the general guidelines and basic principles which form the basis for Tunisia's position on this matter.

31. In that regard, the Tunisian delegation would like to reaffirm the consistency of Tunisia's position on the question of Western Sahara, a question which is of interest to the Maghreb region as a whole.

32. I should like to emphasize that Tunisia's position on this matter remains unchanged in substance, inasmuch as from the very outset it has continued to appeal for a peaceful and just solution within the context of the Maghreb. Indeed, we have always considered that the best approach would be one that would establish appropriate conditions for an honourable solution which would preserve peace and stability in the region and which would be able to open the way to an era of co-operation based on the confidence that is necessary for the building of the Greater Maghreb in the interests of all States of the region and for the benefit of their peoples.

33. It need hardly be recalled here that the Sahara conflict has so far been a stumbling block in the way of all the efforts made to ensure the building of Maghreb, something which Tunisia fervently wishes to see established as an interdependent, complementary and unified entity. In that spirit Tunisia approved the actions undertaken by the OAU, particularly the decisions of the Conference of Heads of State or Government at its eighteenth and nineteenth ordinary sessions, since it is convinced that these could form a favourable framework allowing for progress in the right direction. In the same spirit, it joined in the consensus that emerged at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

34. Moreover, in the hope of making progress towards a solution of the Sahara conflict, Tunisia has spared no effort to bring the points of view closer together and to create a climate propitious to dialogue and conciliation. In this regard, it had hoped that, as was the case last year, the Fourth Committee would achieve a consensus based on the two texts of a draft resolution first submitted to it, which, if there had been sufficient time and a stronger will for dialogue, could have led to the consensus so deeply desired.

35. With regard to the draft resolution on Western Sahara contained in paragraph 15 of part II of document A/39/696, the delegation of Tunisia would

like to emphasize that its intention to vote in favour of this text is primarily due to the general nature of this draft resolution, which, from its point of view, restates in substance those considerations which seem crucial and which are already contained in resolutions AHG/Res. 103 and 104 of the OAU, to which Tunisia remains firmly dedicated.

36. We believe that these considerations have the advantage and merit of contributing to the search for a lasting solution to the question of Western Sahara, while advocating *inter alia* a cease-fire and the organization of a referendum for self-determination.

37. Tunisia, for its part, continues to hope that reason and wisdom will ultimately prevail and that a negotiated settlement will speedily put an end to this deplorable conflict, the continuation of which is a threat to the peace and stability of the region as well as an obstacle to the establishment of that Maghreb which remains the shared and heartfelt aspiration of all the peoples of the Maghreb.

38. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Honduras wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution concerning Western Sahara.

39. When a conflict arises anywhere in the world, Honduras tries to support any and all efforts or initiatives to find a peaceful and comprehensive solution of the problem, with full respect for the honour of the parties concerned and with the even-handedness which must prevail in any solution. That is the consistent stand of my delegation, for we believe that it is our responsibility within the United Nations both to find formulas to foster agreement among the peoples of the great United Nations family and to avoid anything which might cause greater discord within that family.

40. It is in that context that we take our decisions about how to vote on the various regional and sub-regional questions which are the subject of draft resolutions in this Organization. It is in this way that we show our interest in regional and sub-regional unity.

41. That is why we had decided to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.4/39/L.13 and L.14/Rev.1 on the question of Western Sahara submitted to the Fourth Committee. Those two texts reaffirmed the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence, which, in this case, could be exercised after a cease-fire, permitting a peaceful, fair referendum with appropriate international machinery and guarantees, freely accepted by the parties concerned under the terms of those two draft resolutions.

42. As draft resolution A/C.4/39/L.14/Rev.1 was unexpectedly withdrawn, the Committee had before it only one draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/39/L.13 in the Committee, convinced that in the circumstances it would be supported by nearly all the countries from that region. However, the results show that more than a dozen African countries abstained or did not participate in the voting; one even voted against the draft resolution.

43. In those circumstances, and in order to do nothing which might affect the possibility of finding a peaceful solution based on the free consent of all the parties directly concerned, a solution which would have the support of all African countries, Honduras will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/39/L.13.

44. Mr. OYOUÉ (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is soon to take a decision on the draft resolution relating to Western Sahara, and my delegation wishes once again to express my country's hope that the conflict in Western Sahara will find a peaceful solution, in accordance with the various resolutions adopted on this subject by the OAU and the United Nations.

45. In this connection, there is no need to recall here that this dispute is of grave concern to the entire African continent. My delegation's interest in this conflict is all the greater in that it takes place in a region with all of whose States my country maintains excellent relations of friendship and co-operation. That is why Gabon believes that we must rely, in any settlement process, on principles consistent with the search for ways and means of reaching a compromise which could be supported by this Organization and accepted by all the parties concerned.

46. In any event, for Gabon, the problem of Western Sahara is a question of self-determination which can be resolved only on the basis of the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

47. At this stage, it is vital that a referendum be organized in order to guarantee the possibility of a peaceful settlement of the dispute. Since the two parties concerned are convinced of the need to organize a referendum on self-determination, Gabon earnestly hopes that the international community will assist them in bringing this about in the near future.

48. Both within and outside the United Nations it is more than ever the moment to seek a compromise solution which would lead to the best possible settlement of the question of Western Sahara, which has lasted far too long.

49. In this context, Gabon, faithful to its policy of dialogue, tolerance and peace, will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution on this subject. That abstention should be understood to reflect Gabon's continuing concern for the promotion by peaceful means of the search for a just and lasting solution to this deplorable conflict.

50. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to take decisions on the various recommendations of the Fourth Committee. We turn first to the 10 draft resolutions recommended for adoption in paragraph 24 of part I of the report [*A/39/696*]. Draft resolution I, entitled "Question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/30).

51. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Question of American Samoa". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/31).

52. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Question of Guam". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/32).

53. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Question of Bermuda". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 39/33).

54. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "Question of the British Virgin Islands". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 39/34).

55. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will turn next to draft resolution VI, entitled "Question of the Cayman Islands". This draft resolution was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 39/35).

56. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VII, entitled "Question of Montserrat", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 39/36).

57. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 39/37).

58. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Question of the United States Virgin Islands". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 39/38).

59. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution X is entitled "Question of Anguilla". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 39/39).

60. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to turn to the three draft consensuses recommended for adoption in paragraph 25 of part I of the report [*A/39/696*]. Draft consensus I is entitled "Question of Tokelau". The Fourth Committee adopted this draft consensus without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft consensus I was adopted (decision 39/408).

61. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus II is entitled "Question of Pitcairn". The Fourth Committee adopted draft consensus II without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft consensus II was adopted (decision 39/409).

62. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus III is entitled "Question of Gibraltar." In this connection, an amendment has been circulated in document A/39/L.27. In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly will first take a decision on the amendment. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt this amendment?

The amendment issued in document A/39/L.27 was adopted.

63. The PRESIDENT: The Fourth Committee adopted draft consensus III without objection. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft consensus as it has just been amended?

Draft consensus III, as amended, was adopted (decision 39/410).

64. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the draft decision entitled "Question of St. Helena" recommended for adoption in paragraph 26 of part I of the report [*A/39/696*]. I shall now put that draft decision to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, Turkey.

The draft decision was adopted by 119 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions (decision 39/411).

65. The PRESIDENT: Finally, the Assembly will turn to the draft resolution entitled "Question of Western Sahara" which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 15 of part II of the report [*A/39/696*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 42 abstentions (resolution 39/40).

66. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Argentina, who wishes to explain his vote.

67. Mr. BEAUGE (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We voted in favour of the draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara because it is in conformity with previous consensuses of the General Assembly and the Organization of African Unity affirming the inalienable right of the Sahraoui people to self-determination and calling for a cease-fire and the holding of a referendum in the Territory. In this regard we note with satisfaction that the Government of Morocco has repeated its intention to consult the people of Western Sahara. At the same time, my delegation sincerely regrets that it was not possible to produce a consensus text, not only because we maintain most cordial relations with all the peoples and countries of the Maghreb, but also because clearly the participation of Morocco is indispensable if we are to bring about a final solution to the problem of Western Sahara.

68. Consequently, we associate ourselves in the appeal to the interested parties to co-operate in the search for a compromise which will take account in a balanced way of the principles and facts pertaining to this unfortunate problem. This is an established doctrine in the field of decolonization. The particular features of each Territory should not be disregarded. Common sense and experience confirm that there can be no better guarantee of protection of the long-term interests of the Territories than the agreement and co-operation of the region in which they will have to continue to live.

69. The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 103. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories Transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations", which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 8 of the report [*A/39/676*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 39/41).

70. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 104. The Assembly will first take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa", which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 11 of the report [*A/39/663*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mozambique[1], Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions (resolution 39/42).

71. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision entitled "Military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration, which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples", which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 12 of the report [*A/39/663*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Malawi, Mozambique[1], New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft decision was adopted by 118 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions (decision 39/412).

72. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda items 105 and 12. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations", which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 12 of the report [*A/39/690*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to 3, with 22 abstentions (resolution 39/43).

73. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 106. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa", which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 8 of the report [*A/39/677*]. The Fourth Committee adopted the draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/44).

74. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 107. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-

Self-Governing Territories", which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 7 of the report [*A/39/678*]. The Fourth Committee adopted that draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/45).

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.

NOTE

[1] The delegation of Mozambique subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

88th PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 6 December 1984, at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed tomorrow, Friday, at 12 noon. May I take it that the General Assembly agrees to that proposal?

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

3. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*interpretation from French*): A year ago, the General Assembly reiterated the appeal of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. In endorsing the idea of such a conference, the Assembly expressed its will and commitment to the view that peace in the Middle East can be achieved through promoting sincere dialogue among all the parties concerned. This position itself was the result of a dual awareness: awareness of the fact that the path to peace, however long it may be, must give precedence to dialogue over the force of arms; but also awareness particularly of the fact that the time factor is of paramount importance in the search for peace and that, if no action is taken, the international community could be exposed to disastrous consequences in the Middle East region.

4. Guided by these considerations and by the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly in resolutions 38/58 A and B, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has in the course of the past year focused most of its attention on efforts to promote the convening of the aforementioned conference, thus supplementing the actions taken by the Secretary-General, to whom we wish to pay a tribute for his untiring efforts in the cause of the Palestinian people.

5. It will be recalled that in section III of the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[1] which was adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine and endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session and whose implementation was entrusted to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the following is specifically stated:

> "The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, convinced of the important role of world-wide public opinion in resolving the question of Palestine, and in the implementation of the Declaration and Programme of Action, urges and encourages:
>
> ". . .
>
> "(2) Non-governmental organizations and professional and popular associations to intensify their efforts to support the rights of the Palestinian people in every possible way;
>
> ". . .
>
> "(9) Parliamentarians, political parties, trade unions, organizations for solidarity and intellectuals, particularly in Western Europe and North America, to join their counterparts in other parts of the world in giving their support, where it has not been done, to an initiative which would express the desire of the international community to see the Palestinian people at last living in their own independent homeland in peace, freedom and dignity."

It is therefore basically within the context of increasing the awareness of the international community in the promotion of the objectives put forward by the Conference that I wish to place the work of the Committee in presenting its report [*A/39/35*].

6. In accordance with resolution 38/58 B, the Committee organized a North American non-governmental organization symposium on the question of Palestine from 25 to 27 June 1984 in New York. That symposium, which was the first of its kind, had the participation of more than 60 organizations based in the United States and Canada and, after three days of productive debate, it adopted the North American Declaration, which is annexed to the Committee's report [*ibid., annex IV*].

7. In that declaration, whose obvious interest makes it worthy of our attention, North American non-governmental organizations not only expressed support for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East but also committed themselves to co-ordinating and stepping up efforts to mobilize public opinion and Governments in favour of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to build a State within the historic borders of Palestine.

8. The particularly encouraging results of this symposium led the Committee to organize at Geneva two months later, from 20 to 22 August, an international non-governmental organization meeting on the question of Palestine. Some 100 organizations from all over the world participated in that meeting and adopted a resolution which is important for more than one reason. They not only committed themselves to campaigning in their respective countries in favour of an international peace conference on the Middle East, but also decided to establish an interim co-ordinating committee on Palestine. This is particularly encouraging, as the interim committee is composed of organizations from the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France, and also, and above all, from the occupied territories—specifically the West Bank—and Israel.

9. Another outstanding aspect of the meeting was that the non-governmental organizations decided to launch a campaign to collect signatures from among the peoples of the entire world in favour of convening an international conference on peace in the Middle East. That campaign was launched on 29 November 1984—the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People—and will end in one year, on 29 November 1985.

10. At the request of the participants in the Geneva meeting, we decided to include their important resolution in the Committee's report [*ibid., annex V*].

11. In addition to these activities involving non-governmental organizations, the Committee organized at Tunis, from 14 to 17 August 1984, the ninth United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine. That seminar brought together parliamentarians and scholars from 17 European and African countries and resulted in an appeal to all parliamentarians throughout the world to step up their national action to enable people better to understand the realities of the question of Palestine. It is appropriate to stress here that, at this critical stage in the efforts of the United Nations to improve the chance of a negotiated solution, the support of scholars, parliamentarians and other influential groups is an important element in mobilizing public opinion in favour of the solution sought by the United Nations.

12. This is only an outline of a few of the most noteworthy activities of the Committee during the past year. There were many other activities, by the Department of Public Information and by Committee representatives at various international conferences. I shall not dwell on these, for they are set out clearly in the report.

13. The international community has come to recognize that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East conflict and that enjoyment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights is indispensable for the solution of that problem. Those rights have repeatedly been reaffirmed by the General Assembly and include the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination without outside interference, its right to national independence and sovereignty, including the right to establish its own State in Palestine, and the right of Palestinians to return to their homes from which they have been displaced and uprooted and to regain possession of their property or to receive compensation if they do not wish to return. Moreover, acting objectively and on the basis of the realities, the Committee recognized the right to exist of all States of the region.

14. It will be recalled also that, at the request of the General Assembly, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People drew up a programme for the attainment of these rights, which has been endorsed many times by the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority. However, as everyone knows, the Security Council has been unable to take action on these recommendations owing to the opposition of one of its permanent members. As I have already said, any proposal aimed at solving the Palestinian problem without taking into consideration the essential factors of these recommendations is doomed to failure and would, indeed, perpetuate a situation which imperils international peace and security.

15. We have reached a critical, decisive stage in the process of restoring Palestinian rights. Each day that passes without progress on the path charted by the Committee merely complicates a situation which, unfortunately, is already difficult. The gradual annexation of the illegally occupied territories, the increasingly repressive measures taken against the Palestinian population, and the cycle of violence clearly demonstrate that it is high time to reach a just and lasting settlement of the Palestinian question.

16. In its report, the Committee again reaffirms the validity of its recommendations [*ibid., annex I*] and requests the Assembly to insist once more that the Security Council adopt positive measures to implement these recommendations, on which action should have been taken long ago. Moreover, the Committee reaffirms the validity of the recommendations of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, emphasizing especially that the international community must begin immediately to focus its activities on the necessary preparations for convening the proposed international peace conference on the Middle East, as endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, with the participation of all the parties concerned.

17. In this connection, I wish to reiterate the Committee's deep appreciation of the contacts initiated by the Secretary-General. While the Committee regrets the negative position of certain countries, it is none the less determined to pursue its efforts to ensure that the conference is convened soon, for it is convinced that the holding of this conference will be an important step towards the settlement of the question of Palestine. We call now on all the parties concerned to rise above emotion and passion and to co-operate in the achievement of a positive result in the interests of peace and justice.

18. With that goal in mind, the Committee is particularly encouraged by the massive support given by the international community to the proposal on the convening of the conference and by the mounting evidence that these recommendations are now better known and understood throughout the world. Other positive factors are the notable increase in interest in the question of Palestine and the militant support of non-governmental organizations for the Palestinian cause.

19. It cannot be repeated too often that the present situation in the Middle East is a constant reminder to the international community of the urgent need to increase efforts to find a solution to the Palestinian problem.

20. There is no better proof of this urgency than the situation which persists in the occupied territories. Today, 17 years after the 1967 occupation, more than a third of the land in the West Bank has been confiscated by the Israeli authorities for the establishment of settlements. At the same time, Israel is tightening its grip on the water resources of the occupied territories, the use of which by the Palestinian population is limited by harsh restrictions.

21. Thus, as time passes, Israel is transforming the West Bank and Gaza into a pool of cheap labour and an outlet for its products through the restrictions imposed by the Israeli authorities on the establishment of new industries.

22. This process of stifling the economy of the occupied territories contributes to emptying them of their most educated inhabitants, increases their dependence on Israel and is a denial of everything that might serve as the beginning of a future Palestinian State.

23. The salvaging of the occupied territories is more than ever inseparable from a political solution of the Palestinian question. Dialogue among all the parties concerned, including, first and foremost, the Palestinian people, is a necessary part of that process.

24. On 29 November I had an opportunity to say something that I will repeat today: "Peace is one and indivisible."

25. We consider that at this critical stage it is imperative that efforts be redoubled in order to find a just solution to the question of Palestine and to put an end to the unnecessary suffering of the Palestinian people and others in the region. We appeal to the international community to shoulder its responsibility within the context of dialogue in order to ensure a felicitous solution to this tragedy that has lasted for nearly 40 years. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People urges you to work to assure that such a dialogue will begin.

26. The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Victor Gauci, of Malta, Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to present the report of the Committee.

27. Mr. GAUCI (Malta), Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People: My presentation of the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*A/39/35*] in reality symbolizes another year of festering conflict and wrongs unrighted. On the question of Palestine, the time has now come not so much to speak of many things, but rather to concentrate on a few of the main elements of this tragic issue.

28. If we really wish, again, to speak of many things, there are enough details in paragraphs 18 to 89 of the report to demonstrate clearly the present disheartening state of affairs. Those paragraphs, as well as other more specific reports referred to therein or presented before the Assembly's Special Political Committee, contain more than enough evidence to prove conclusively—if any proof were really needed—that all is not well in the State of Palestine.

29. Those same paragraphs also contain enough evidence to convince any objective observer beyond a reasonable doubt that a continuation of the policies currently applied on the spot cannot bring about reconciliation, let alone the peace which the protagonists claim to seek and for which the Committee, by consensus, has striven strenuously for the past eight years. In so doing, the Committee was only shedding light and concentrating attention on the key issue by furthering almost 40 years of effort by the United Nations to bring about a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East.

30. It must in all candor also be admitted that the evidence contained in those paragraphs provides ample ammunition to fuel a heated debate. Regrettable as this may be, it is not, however, what the Committee seeks. An acrimonious round of bitter recrimination, of accusation and counter-accusation, repeated year in and year out, is neither a formula nor a substitute for peace. What is even worse, it provides convenient ammunition for those who contend that seeking a solution through the proposed international peace conference on the Middle East is not likely to succeed, judging by the outcome of the past debates.

31. The Committee nevertheless has to stress with regret that the contents of the report cannot but reflect the untenable situation on the spot. Truth cannot be suppressed. There is no question that the cycle of violence goes on. In addition, it cannot be denied that many years after the flurry and expectation raised by partial approaches and shuttle diplomacy, the situation remains grim. It can be summed up in a few brief but poignant sentences.

Mr. Wasiuddin (Bangladesh), Vice-President, took the Chair.

32. Small, friendly Lebanon is in turmoil, with much of its territory occupied. Resentment runs riot in the occupied territories, with popular protest being subdued by massive military repression. Violence erupts sporadically. Unperturbed, disdainful of public opinion and legality, and against opposition from within and from without, Israel continues its illegal settlements and annexation policies in the occupied territories, policies which are universally held to be an obstacle to peace.

33. Peaceful initiatives on the spot are conspicuous by their absence. Instead, the policies of fear, hate and force predominate, lavishly fueled by sophisticated weapons, to the detriment of economic development. To say that this is a bleak background is to put it mildly. To repeat the details is merely to deaden their impact.

34. Let us therefore stick to the essentials. Is there no ray of hope to pierce this persistent gloom? The Committee believes that there is. The Committee itself has shown the right path, and it must continue its labours until its recommendations are followed through and the goal achieved. Here, very briefly, are the main reasons for our undiminished hope.

35. First, the recommendations of the Committee, repeatedly endorsed by the General Assembly and subsequently further refined by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, are the only—I repeat—the only formula adopted by international consensus which advocates a procedure permitting all the protagonists in the conflict to be involved in the search for a comprehensive solution based on justice and international law.

36. Secondly, the real nature of the Palestine question is now widely known in all four quarters of the globe, again thanks to the efforts of the Committee. Time and time again, without exception, in all the regions where seminars and symposiums have been organized in the past few years, our audiences—even

the most sceptical among them—have been convinced that the recommendations of the Committee stand the most rigid tests of fairness, legality and peaceful scope, overlooking the vital interests of none of the protagonists and hence likely to last if implemented. The Chairman of the Committee has just provided the highlights of our activities in this field and I need not therefore repeat them.

37. Thirdly, we have gathered support from hundreds of non-governmental organizations, trade union representatives, journalists and members of the academic community in advocating action and redress for the practical attainment of the rights of the Palestinian people. A spontaneous campaign to obtain signatures favouring peace is already under way.

38. Fourthly, and perhaps most important, we are advocating an approach through the Security Council, first bringing about contacts and *rapprochement*, then promoting a comprehensive solution and subsequently even providing guarantees to ensure its observance if necessary. This laborious procedure is proof enough that the interests of no single party will be overlooked. Those who claim the contrary clearly misunderstand the Committee's approach.

39. This background provides the positive thinking behind the recommendations of the Committee this year, contained in paragraphs 155 to 160 of its report. Those sound and peaceful recommendations stand in marked contrast to the sense of despondency and despair in that volatile and violent region. But in order to succeed, we need the positive contribution of all concerned. As stated in paragraph 160 of the report: "The Committee . . . strongly recommends that international action should henceforth concentrate on the preparations necessary for the convening of this Conference and contribute to its successful and peaceful outcome." We therefore earnestly trust that all nations in this Assembly will no longer delay in responding to this call, and we urge the Secretary-General to pursue the valiant efforts he has already initiated.

40. In essence, what we would be doing in 1984 is start on the unfinished part of the solution envisaged in 1947. In 1947, the partition plan did not enjoy unanimous backing, but one side of the plan was fully implemented. Many events have taken place in the area since then which have caused changes on the map of the region but have not brought about peace or security. The one event that has not taken place is the most fundamental and enlightened of all: it is the free and unfettered act of self-determination by the Palestinian people. In 1984, therefore, the international backing for this overdue act of self-determination by the Palestinian people is almost unanimous; it obviously provides the essential ingredient of a lasting solution.

41. So many opportunities in the past have been missed; history provides the record and the events and on-the-spot evidence. But the window of opportunity is not yet closed. The Assembly this year should ensure that the window remains open and should encourage the Security Council next year to strive energetically to finalize the necessary preparations for the international peace conference on the Middle East. All the spadework has been done; all the ingredients of a solution are before the Council awaiting its final touches and backed by its supreme authority. Further delay would be prejudicial to the prospects. It is time to replace reckless rhetoric by sober statesmanship and a specific sense of purpose. As with all problems, if we just put one foot firmly on the ground before the other, keep our heads cool and co-operate spontaneously, we can succeed.

42. As my delegation stated when it replied to the letter from the Secretary-General, dated 9 March 1984, concerning the convening of the international peace conference on the Middle East:

> "The potential benefits of such an approach cannot be over-emphasized. In particular, the present sense of drift and despair in the Middle East could be transformed into an energetic momentum for a concerted search for peace. That in itself, and by itself, would be a significant development on the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations." [*A/39/231*.]

43. It is, I submit, no longer proper for individual countries to invoke procedural difficulties against a comprehensive approach, which in any case is now not only the conclusion of the Committee but also the unanimous recommendation of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine. The protagonists themselves need encouragement to overcome inertia. The final solution will need universal backing and effective support—guarantees if need be, not based on the force of arms but on the common benefit of peace. Hard work and long negotiations will be required, but a start and an essential change of direction are necessary now.

44. The mutual concessions that will be required from Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*] to clinch a peace settlement would be more likely to be achieved in a package deal in a comprehensive solution enjoying unanimous and universal support.

45. Permit me to end by once more acclaiming the leadership and dedicated service of Mr. Sarré, who has guided us through another year of hard work. I also wish to express my appreciation to all members for their own contribution and for the assistance they have extended to me in my eight years of rapporteurship of the Committee.

46. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, the Head of the Political Department of the PLO. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX).

47. Mr. KADDOUMI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am pleased to congratulate Mr. Lusaka on his election to the presidency of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly and, through him, to greet his friendly country, Zambia, and its great President, Kenneth Kaunda, who has always supported the just struggle of our Palestinian people and of the peoples of the African continent and the non-aligned States. I am confident that Mr. Lusaka's wisdom, extensive experience and firm belief in the principles of justice and peace will guarantee the success of the work of this session.

48. I am also pleased to take this opportunity to express thanks and appreciation to his predecessor, Mr. Jorge Illueca, whose valuable efforts in conducting the work of the Assembly's thirty-eighth session greatly contributed to the results achieved.

49. I wish to congratulate most warmly the State of Brunei Darussalam on its accession to independence and its admission to membership of the United Nations.

50. I cannot fail to note with appreciation the great efforts of the Secretary-General in the interest of world peace and in affirming the role of the United Nations, notwithstanding the attempt to destroy its efforts. I should also like to emphasize our full confidence in him and our continued readiness to co-operate with the United Nations in achieving security and a just peace in the Middle East.

51. We meet today as we approach the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, which came into existence in the wake of the most atrocious experience in the history of mankind—the Second World War. The United Nations came into being to establish a system to govern relations among States and nations based on respect for the right of peoples to freedom and independence, as well as on co-operation and equality instead of exploitation, oppression, domination and aggression.

52. The world community continues to be faced with numerous dangers to world security and peace; many peoples, including the Palestinian people, continue to be denied their basic rights as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

53. As I said in an earlier statement before the Assembly, I can find hardly any other issue which, like the question of Palestine, the United Nations has had to face since its establishment and which has remained a constant item on its agenda since 1947.

54. From 1947 to the present time, the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as numerous United Nations committees and specialized agencies, have adopted many resolutions, all of which affirm that the Palestinian people, like the other peoples of the world, have a natural right to freedom, independence and sovereignty in their own land.

55. In spite of all these resolutions, the results and realities have been quite different: Palestine was usurped in its entirety, the majority of its people were displaced and became refugees, their property was expropriated and they were subjected to a series of systematic pogroms and massacres, from Deir Yassin in 1948 to the massacres of Sabra and Shatila in 1982.

56. In nearly 40 years, Israel has deliberately and flagrantly violated every decision, every resolution of the United Nations. Is it not truly regrettable that Israel continues to occupy a seat in the Assembly? That is a sad anomaly and an affront to all the ideals and values for which the world Organization was established.

57. What is the significance of the constant presence of the question of Palestine in the agenda of the General Assembly ever since the establishment of the United Nations? We have no doubt that this fact indicates deep understanding and full recognition by the international community of the gross injustice that befell the Palestinian people, as well as the necessity to find a just and lasting solution to this problem in spite of all the difficulties and challenges. It further very clearly indicates that the international community rejects Israel's continued policy of force, oppression and occupation against our Arab Palestinian people.

58. In spite of the inability of the United Nations to find practical means to bring about respect for, and actual implementation of its resolutions, because of the United States policy of hegemony and obstruction and its absolute bias in favour of Israel, the political and moral power represented by the will and resolutions of the United Nations is the expression of the adherence by the international community to the principles of the Charter, principles which we all seek to respect in the face of the policy of force and aggression.

59. In this sense, we consider that the struggle of the Palestinian people for freedom and independence is the cause of all of you as much as it is our cause; it is the cause of the United Nations itself. It is a cause that concerns humanity as a whole, for it is a cause of right and justice which represents the aspirations of the international community to establish a better world in which peoples enjoy their freedom and sovereignty, a world not governed by the law of the jungle, a world free of the policy of force, a world in the image of the Charter which Members of the Organization signed 40 years ago.

60. During the general debate and the debate on the situation in the Middle East, we listened carefully to the statements of Presidents and of representatives of Member States. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that the overwhelming majority of the speakers seemed to share a common point of view regarding the question of Palestine. They stressed that Israel, which occupies Palestinian and Arab territories, should withdraw from all of them, including Jerusalem. The overwhelming majority of the international community condemned the policy of occupation, expansion and settlement pursued by Israel in the occupied territories and called for the cessation of those practices, as the continuation of that situation in the Middle East constitutes a tinder-box which threatens the security of the entire world.

61. We have noticed almost total agreement that any just and lasting solution to the situation in this region should include, first and foremost, a solution to the question of Palestine, the core of the conflict in the Middle East region. Such a solution should be based on enabling the Palestinian people to recover their legitimate inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination, to the creation of an independent state on its national soil and to return to that land. An acceptable framework for the search for such a solution is the United Nations and its resolutions pertaining to the question of Palestine. Such a solution should be reached through convening an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation, on an equal footing, of all the parties, including the PLO, the two super-Powers and all the other States concerned. It is clear from these debates that the overwhelming majority of the States of the world consider the PLO to be the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and that, therefore, it is impossible to ignore its role and its right to participate in all international efforts aimed at finding an acceptable solution to the Middle East crisis and the question of Palestine.

62. This is the will of the Organization, which is reflected in the overwhelming majority of the statements of Member States and in the numerous resolutions adopted by the Assembly over the past years.

63. On the other hand, we heard some statements which represented a total departure from the general opinion of the international community and an absolute disregard of United Nations resolutions.

Those statements were delivered by the representatives of the United States and Israel.

64. The United States President, Mr. Reagan, declared before this Assembly at this session [*4th meeting*] his adherence to his Middle East initiative, which he announced on 1 September 1982.[2] It had been expected that the United States President would adopt a new position that would take into account the will of the international community, the realities of the situation in the region and the new developments which proved the failure of United States policy there, particularly on the Lebanese scene, because that policy, as we had always said, ignored the crux of the conflict in the Middle East region—namely, the question of Palestine—and denied the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

65. Following President Reagan's proposal, Israel stepped up its oppression of the peoples of Palestine and Lebanon and increased the pace of land expropriation and the establishment of settlements. In addition, the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel was strengthened, and the latter has received more arms and more financial aid. This has encouraged Israel to continue its policy of aggression and occupation, posing a serious threat to the security of the Arab States and to peace in the region and in the world. It is well known that all this aid is given at the expense of the American taxpayer and the United States budget deficit and, above all, of course, at the expense of the peoples of Palestine and Lebanon, whose suffering is increased.

66. In addition, the United States, not satisfied with absolving itself of its international responsibilities, has worked to hinder and obstruct all the peaceful international efforts by exercising its veto power in the Security Council in an arbitrary manner against the interests of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples; this has brought us to the current stalemate and tension. With regard to the question of Palestine in particular, the United States Administration has persisted in denying the rights of the Palestinian people and disregarding the resolutions and Charter of the United Nations by continuing to reject the establishment of an independent Palestinian State.

67. The membership of the United Nations is now made up of 159 States—some big, with millions of people; others small, with populations not even reaching tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands. Why does the United States deny the Palestinian people its right to establish a State of its own, to be the 160th Member State, for example, in accordance with all international principles, charters and conventions?

68. The Palestinian people do exist; they are vigorous, active, creative, militant and able. They are proud of their national identity, land and homeland. They are a people with a long history, one of the oldest peoples of the earth. Palestine existed before Israel, as the Bible itself states. All the revealed religions were nurtured in the land of Palestine; it is holy to us all. Why should the people who bear its name be deprived of their most basic human rights? The Palestinian people today number about 5 million, of which a high percentage are highly trained. They include specialists in all fields. They participate alongside their fellow Arabs in the brother Arab States in developing the region, and they play a distinct, positive role that is respected and appreciated by all.

69. I want to ask the Assembly in all honesty and sincerity: Why does the United States take a hostile attitude towards the Palestinian people and their inalienable right to self-determination? Moreover, by what right does the United States draw up two separate categories of people: those that can have an independent State, and those that cannot or should not have an independent State? If the United States does not wish to recognize the PLO—a position which is condemned—that is its business; but to refuse to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination constitutes a question of law, morality and principle and is equivalent to refusing to recognize the Charter and principles of the United Nations itself.

70. The PLO has proved that it represents a positive and effective element in the international community, despite all the attempts and conspiracies of Israel, over a period of 20 years, to destroy it and to break the massive support it enjoys. To this end, Israel has used all methods of terror and armed aggression. But, in spite of the difficulties we have confronted from time to time, all these Israeli attempts have failed; they have led, instead, to the greater rallying of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and in the diaspora around the PLO and its legitimate role of leadership.

71. Perhaps the greatest proof of this cohesion was the convening of the Palestine National Council only a few days ago in the Jordanian capital, Amman, in the midst of a great popular Palestinian demonstration of welcome and support. The convening of the seventeenth session of the Palestine National Council was a new plebiscite, held before the eyes of the entire world. It affirmed the desire of the Palestinian people to keep the PLO, its legitimate institutions and its democratic processes. Our people have renewed, through this council, their full confidence in its elected, legitimate leadership, under the chairmanship of Brother Yasser Arafat.

72. The session of the Palestine National Council, convened at Amman, was an important occasion, emphasizing the distinctive relations that bind together the Palestinian and Jordanian peoples, who share a common goal and destiny. The Council renewed its adherence to the resolution adopted at the previous session, in Algeria in 1983, which provided for the establishment of future relations between Palestine and Jordan on a confederal basis, after the withdrawal of Israel and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State. Our people have thus reaffirmed, through the Palestine National Council, their absolute rejection of Zionist and imperialist schemes aimed at creating an alternative homeland for the Palestinian people in Jordan. These schemes are in fact designed to perpetuate Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories, displace their population and ultimately annex them. The Palestinian people will not accept an alternative to its original homeland.

73. In addition, the Palestine National Council underscored the need to co-operate with the fraternal people of Jordan to ensure joint Arab action to liberate the land and enable the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights.

74. In line with the consistent position of the PLO in the search for an acceptable peace in the Middle East based on recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to return, to self-determination, and to the

creation of an independent Palestinian State with Jerusalem as its capital, our National Council has endorsed the call to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, the two super-Powers and other interested States, within the framework of the United Nations and on the basis of its resolutions. Our National Council welcomed the Soviet initiative of 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*] and reaffirmed its rejection of all schemes that deny the right of our people to self-determination, such as the self-rule scheme and President Reagan's initiative. It called on the United Nations, and, in particular, the Security Council, to shoulder its responsibilities and implement its resolutions.

75. Finally, the convening of the latest session of the Palestine National Council at Amman and the resolutions it adopted provided a new opportunity to stress the national identity of an independent Palestine and the desire to maintain the independence of our national decision-making body. It also demonstrated the cohesiveness of the people and their leadership, represented by the PLO, and the determination and will of the Palestinian people, despite all the difficulties and obstacles, to continue their struggle by all available means to achieve the goals for which they have long struggled, at the cost of great sacrifices.

76. Since the last session of the General Assembly, many things have happened which should be examined, in view of the consequences they have had on the situation in the region. All peace efforts have come to a halt or have been aborted. We lost a year of international effort in this direction because of United States and Israeli intransigence, in spite of the existence of numerous international projects and initiatives which the PLO had welcomed, such as the Arab peace plan, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[3] the Soviet initiative of 15 September 1982,[4] and the French-Egyptian plan submitted to the Security Council on 28 July 1982.[5]

77. Furthermore, the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, was attended by the representatives of 138 States and 104 non-governmental organizations, as well as many international personalities. As the Assembly knows, the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights adopted by the Conference[1] reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and underlined the fact that Israel must withdraw from all the occupied territories, including Jerusalem. The Conference also called for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. In spite of that appeal, in spite of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolutions on that question and in spite of the efforts and consultations of the Secretary-General concerning the convening of the conference, the United States and Israel took a negative stand and rejected the proposal.

78. The United States continues to obstruct efforts towards peace in the region carried out within the framework of the United Nations and in keeping with its resolutions. It is trying to impose partial and separate solutions that the Palestinian people and the Arab nation have already rejected. Such United States attempts will not contribute to peace in the Middle East; rather, they have caused conflicts and massacres, from whose destructive effects and consequences both the Palestinian people and the brother Lebanese people continue to suffer.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

79. The period in question was characterized by the efforts of the Israeli authorities to prepare as far as possible the material conditions for the annexation of the occupied territories. The former Israeli Minister of Defence, Moshe Arens, expressed that policy by stating: "We quickly reach the point where irreversible facts become the basis of our control over Judea and Samaria"—that is, the West Bank. For that purpose, the Israeli authorities have intensified their terrorist practices against the Palestinian people in that region so as to force them to leave their lands. Even more serious during this period was a series of bomb explosions aimed at Palestinian population centres, as well as Christian and Muslim places of worship, in numerous occupied Palestinian towns and villages.

80. Examples of those incidents include the cowardly attack on the University of Hebron and on a Palestinian civilian bus in Jerusalem. Before that, there were expulsions, deportations, arrests, the imposition of exorbitant fines, house arrests, curfews, and the demolition of houses in Nablus, Hebron, Jerusalem and Ramallah. Also, Al-Najah University and schools and colleges in the city of Nablus were closed down for a long period. These measures were accompanied by attacks on holy and cultural landmarks in the occupied territories, prominent among which were the attempts to blow up the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Omar Mosque, the attempt to set fire to the Saaddin Mosque in Nablus and the attack on the Ibrahimi Mosque in Hebron.

81. To complement this aggressive policy, a plan was officially announced in Israel aimed at removing the Palestinian refugee camps in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and resettling the refugees. That is what is happening, for example, in the Dheisheh camp, which is run by UNRWA.

82. In the field of education, the cultural war launched by the Israeli occupation authorities has acquired serious dimensions which should not go unnoticed. Educational institutions were among the main targets of Israel's aggressive policy aimed at paralysing them and obstructing them in their job of educating the young generation and preparing it to play its role in the service of its country and society. That is why the Israeli military authorities have placed these institutions under their direct control, have prohibited the circulation and publication of thousands of scientific, cultural and literary works, and have subjected students, teachers and university professors to oppression and terror, such as individual and collective arrests, limitation of residence areas and arbitrary expulsions.

83. Because of these internal crises and the deteriorating internal economic situation, both of which are tightening their grip on Israel, the economic and social conditions of the Palestinians under occupation have worsened and their daily lives have become unbearable. As a result of the Israeli policy of aggression against both the Palestinian and the Lebanese peoples, of the numerous wars launched by Israel against the Arab States, of the allocation of the larger part of its budget to military affairs and to expenditures on occupation and the establishment of

settlements, the Israeli economy is in a state of collapse. The inflation rate, which grows daily, has reached approximately 800 per cent. This situation has produced harmful effects and Fascist phenomena that are extremely dangerous for our people.

84. The greatest expression of this entrenched crisis in the Israeli military society is perhaps the success of a terrorist, the so-called Kahane, in the recent elections to the Israeli Knesset. This has aroused the fears of the democratic, honest and peace-loving forces in the world and even within Israel itself. We see nothing new in the emergence of the racist Kahane phenomenon. It is, in our opinion, the naked expression of all the official Israeli policies against the Palestinian people over so many years. It would be a mistake to believe that it is an isolated, accidental or temporary phenomenon. There are numerous similar Israeli organizations which enjoy official protection, such as the diverse groups rallied around the "integrated land of Israel" movement, the Tehiya and Gush Emunim, and the like of Kahane in the Mifdal and Herut parties. In view of what we have stated, the daily lives of our people under Israeli occupation have become difficult and bitter. The Palestinians are besieged, pursued and oppressed. They are subjected daily to attacks by armed Zionist gangs. This has made their lives and living conditions very complicated. We declare that the Government of Israel bears full responsibility for what is happening in the occupied territories, for it continues to violate the rules of international law and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[6] and refuses to provide protection and security for the Palestinian population. This makes it necessary for the international community and the United Nations to find ways and means to guarantee adequate protection for the population of the occupied territories.

85. This policy, as we have indicated, has harmed not only the Palestinian people but the Jews themselves. Israeli society has become, as a result of the policy of war and aggression, a disrupted society, suffering from ideological and economic bankruptcy, from social, class and racial contradictions; from international isolation and lack of internal peace. In such an atmosphere, as history teaches us, more extreme Fascist and racist currents find fertile ground. Militaristic elements emerge which attempt to export the internal crisis and contain it through launching new wars. Here we cannot but recall the proverb to the effect that a people which oppresses another people cannot itself be free.

86. I have reviewed the current situation with regard to the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East, as well as the new developments which have occurred since the previous session. We do not see any hope concerning the possibility of attaining a comprehensive and just peace as long as the United States and Israel persist in their positions and policies.

87. In spite of the official change in the Government of Israel, on which some have placed their bets, we have not perceived any change in Israeli policy. From the outset we did not pin any hopes on the coming to power of the Labour Party in Israel, for our experience with that party is long and bloody. Its programmes are well known, differing from those of the Likud only in cosmetic details. Both parties want land and reject peace; both refuse to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Both parties insist on building new settlements, expropriating land and persecuting our people. The Labour Party wants a "pure" Jewish State with a clear Jewish majority, even if it has to give up some lands densely populated with Arab inhabitants, while keeping military control, the settlements and Jerusalem. The Likud coalition and its more extreme and racist offshoots want land and the expulsion of the Palestinian people, even if it means resorting to terrorism, massacres and armed violence.

88. Thus, the true option they are putting forward is not "land for peace"; they want only the land, for the peace they are talking about is a peace imposed by force of arms, which is in fact mere capitulation. The recent Israeli elections proved that the entrenched Israeli crisis is more dangerous than many thought it to be and that the true policy of the Israeli leaders is to continue their occupation, war and aggression and their imposition of *faits accomplis* by force of arms.

89. As we have already stated, it is unfortunate that Israel gets from the United States all the material, military and political support it needs. This provides it with billions of dollars and hundreds of aeroplanes, encouraging it to persist in its expansionist policies and to defy the international community and the resolutions of the United Nations. It is unfortunate also that some Western European States have retreated from their support of a peace process in the region based on recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. We call on all those States to play a more positive role in promoting the peace process on that basis.

90. A few days ago, on 29 November, we participated in the commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. I should like again to thank all the States which participated in that commemoration, which is rich in meaning for us and for our steadfast people under occupation and in the diaspora. The commemoration reflected the extent of the concern and interest within the international community in putting an end to the injustice and aggression to which our people continues to be subjected. It also reflected the international community's interest in the situation in the Middle East region, a conflict with the question of Palestine at its core. This dangerous situation threatens the peace and security of the entire world.

91. The collective efforts and persistence of the States Members of the United Nations deserve our appreciation and respect. In this regard, we cannot fail to convey our deep thanks to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and to its Chairman, Mr. Sarré, for their work and their great efforts in performing the tasks entrusted to them by the General Assembly. We hope that the Secretary-General will continue his valuable efforts to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East in accordance with United Nations resolutions, resolutions which we trust will be reaffirmed at this session of the General Assembly.

92. The Palestinian people look towards the United Nations with full confidence and hope that the General Assembly and the Security Council will adopt deterrent measures against the aggressors, not merely resolutions of condemnation and denunciation.

93. I am pleased, on behalf of the Palestinian people, to express our thanks and appreciation to all the friendly States of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, to the socialist countries, and to those States of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe that have supported our struggle for freedom, sovereignty and independence.

94. We have followed the activities of the non-governmental organizations and have taken note of their positions as expressed in the statements and programmes of action they have adopted after the meetings organized for them by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. There is no doubt that the role played by these organizations in awakening world public opinion will have an effective impact, especially as they have launched a global campaign to collect hundreds of thousands of signatures from lovers of peace, justice and humanity in solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people and in favour of convening a peace conference on the basis of United Nations resolutions—the conference for which this Assembly has called.

95. I should like also to express our absolute solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of its legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization, as well as with the struggle of the people of South Africa against the racist régime in that country, and with all those throughout the world who are struggling for freedom and independence.

96. In view of all these facts and events, the Palestinian people are determined to continue their struggle for their national rights by all means. We count on the assistance and support of the States Members of the United Nations for our just cause. The situation in the Middle East region will continue to be tense and explosive as long as the Palestinian people continue to live in refugee camps and to be dispersed and deprived of their inalienable rights.

97. Everyone, in the United Nations and everywhere else, must continue the struggle to save peace by restoring the rights of the Palestinian people to return to its land, to exercise self-determination and to establish an independent State on its own national soil.

98. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In his message to the meeting held on 29 November 1984 in commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, Sheikh Jaber Al-Ahmed Al-Sabah, Emir of the State of Kuwait, said the following:

> "One might well wonder why it is that, 36 years after the catastrophe struck that people, no one has remedied the injustice done to them or taken any resolute action for the implementation of United Nations resolutions, at the very least. If that demonstrates anything it is the lack of seriousness of the big Powers and the indifference of the international community in general, while the aggressor persists in its arbitrary measures and violations, treating international law and the Charter of the United Nations with contempt. Could this aggressor have dared so to transgress had it not been for the unrestricted material support it receives from those in certain quarters that do not understand that by giving such support they are undermining the foundations upon which international legitimacy is itself based?"

99. In the light of the foregoing, it is clear to us that from the outset the Palestinian problem and its ramifications have been dominated by three major elements: first, the unilateral imposition by the Zionist entity of one *fait accompli* after another, employing absolutely despotic force; secondly, the inability of the United Nations to stop this stream of inhumane attacks and practices and to restore the rights of its victims; and, thirdly, the unrestrained support and buttressing, from certain quarters, of Israel's policies and practices.

100. With regard to the first of these elements, United Nations documents from 1948 up to our own day reflect precisely what Israel has done in uprooting and dispersing a peaceful people from its homeland, pursuing it wherever it may be in order to annihilate it, thus violating its most elementary human rights as set forth in the relevant Geneva conventions. Israel has also deliberately attempted to change the social, cultural, demographic and environmental character of the Arab lands in order to eradicate the racial, historical, economic and cultural identity of the Palestinian people.

101. The Palestinian answer to this has been constantly to increase the quality and scope of its resistance and its steadfastness in the occupied territories, despite the most violent acts of repression and torture committed by Israel to suppress those uprisings. While it salutes and absolutely supports the honourable struggle and the steadfastness of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories in preserving their natural rights, Kuwait reiterates that people who fight in order to regain their freedom, their right to self-determination and their independence cannot remain alone. History has made that clear to us. Such fighters will always prove stronger than those who try to dominate them.

102. With regard to the second element that dominates the Palestinian problem—namely, the inability of the United Nations to stem this stream of inhumane attacks and practices—we do not mean to imply that the Organization has been observing the situation with indifference. We are fully aware of the important role played by the Organization in support of the inalienable, legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. But it is clear that the Security Council and the General Assembly are approaching the Palestinian question in two different ways.

103. The Security Council, which is subject to the use of the veto by some of the big Powers that have a special relationship with Israel, takes an unrealistic view of the question of Palestine. It treats it as a refugee problem, as demonstrated by its resolution 242 (1967), and its resolutions are subordinate to the acts of those big Powers which so far have made it impossible for the United Nations to restrain Israel and put an end to its continuing defiance of and contempt for international law and the resolutions of the Security Council itself.

104. We believe that the General Assembly has taken the correct view of the Palestinian problem. In 1969 and 1970, the General Assembly recognized for the first time the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination, and also recognized that respect for those rights was an indispensable element for the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle

East. When the Arab Summit Conference held at Rabat in 1974 recognized the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the General Assembly, in that same year, established a new principle when it decided to invite the PLO to participate in its deliberations as an observer [*resolution 3237 (XXIX)*].

105. This new concept of the dimensions of the Palestinian problem on the part of the General Assembly made it necessary for us to seek effective means to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights. This led to the proposal to establish a special committee to undertake comprehensive studies on this problem and recommend the best way of solving it. Thus, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People was established, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3376 (XXX), and began its work during the thirty-first session.

106. The Committee has made enormous efforts to clarify the various aspects, dimensions and ambiguities of the Palestinian problem, crowning these efforts with the holding at Geneva, from 29 August to 7 September 1983, of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine. The Conference adopted the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[1] which clarified the broad outlines of the Palestinian problem on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions, and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights.[1]

107. In addition, the Committee has continued to follow the Israeli policy of establishing Jewish settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories. Particularly noteworthy in this respect was the valuable report on the danger of the continuing establishment of Israeli settlements in the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, submitted on 25 November 1980 by the Commission established under Security Council resolution 446 (1979).[7] In spite of that and the insistence of the Committee, the Security Council has not yet examined this matter. However, both the General Assembly and the Security Council have declared these Israeli practices to be illegal.

108. The most important recommendation in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine is that which appears in paragraph 5, regarding the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the Organization, with the aim of achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, an essential element of which would be the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in Palestine. The General Assembly endorsed this proposal in its resolution 38/58C, and the Secretary-General sent messages to the countries concerned requesting their opinion on the convening of the conference. As usual, he came up against the refusal of Israel and, unfortunately, of the United States, despite the fact that all other countries concerned welcomed the convening of the conference.

109. My delegation, which considers the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People as the true conscience with regard to the problem of Palestine, would like to thank its Chairman, Mr. Sarré, and the members of the Committee for the valuable efforts they are making. The Committee has expressed, in its report to the current session [*A/39/35*], its regret at the negative position of Israel and the United States on this matter, and we join in that expression. We also support the Committee's resolution on the continuation of efforts to convene the proposed conference as soon as possible, particularly since, in its view, it represents a long-awaited important step. The situation is becoming increasingly dangerous day by day as a result of Israel's feeling of complete immunity, which makes it act as if it had the last word on every matter concerning the Middle East. For the same reason, Kuwait has supported the Soviet initiative of 15 September 1982[4] to convene an international conference to be attended, on an equal footing, by all parties to the conflict, including the PLO.

110. As regards the third, and last element, which continues to affect the Palestinian problem and its ramifications—namely, the unreasonable support and encouragement that Israel receives from certain quarters—we ask the question: Could the aggressor have dared undertake its transgressions had it not been for the unlimited protection and support it receives from Powers that are entrusted with a special responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security? The unmatched United States support, for example, has led to Israel's persistence in perpetrating its crimes against the Palestinian people. Those crimes are sufficient in themselves to make Israel an entity hostile to peace and humanity; they also create in the United Nations a feeling of failure and complete impotence in the face of actions by an entity that is based on the principle of aggression and usurpation. This in turn reflects on the reputation, authority and effectiveness of the United Nations.

111. We have seen how many years ago the General Assembly parted company with the Security Council to the extent that the two bodies seem unrelated to the same Organization and appear not to believe in the same Charter or to work for the same objective—peace and stability in the world.

112. The strange reluctance of the Security Council to take action against measures it considers illegal—action that is recommended in the report of the Committee—is highlighted by the fact that the General Assembly has already set out the just and reasonable path towards the solution of this problem based on a series of resolutions recognizing the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, to return to their homeland and to establish a State on their national soil.

113. This parting of company is, in the opinion of my delegation, the basic reason for the continuation of the problem. It has been frequently confirmed by General Assembly resolutions that world peace and security depend on its solution. As long as some major Powers having special responsibilities reject any movement towards a solution under the pretext that it is not acceptable to Israel, the road ahead of us will remain dark, not because this humanitarian problem will have remained beyond solution or the Palestinian people continued to be dispersed and deprived of their rights in this age when most peoples that were oppressed have gained their independence and sovereignty, but because some of the major Powers, the repositories of world peace and security, will have confirmed by their actions that they want only one kind of peace—a peace that serves their own purposes.

114. In its tireless quest to participate in solving the Palestinian problem through a just solution guaranteeing the natural and legal rights of the Palestinian people, the PLO has accepted the Arab peace plan, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[3] as the basis for a just solution of that problem. It has agreed to the idea of an international peace conference on the Middle East advocated by the United Nations. It has also accepted the Soviet initiative on the convening of an international conference to be attended by all parties to the conflict, including the PLO. However, Israel has rejected every peace proposal, whether international or regional. It has rejected the United Nations framework, with its international legitimacy, for discussing the problem with all parties concerned and has presented no alternative but more aggression, repression and genocide. The Israeli leadership has fully understood that the most dangerous prospect facing it is peace, because the essence of its doctrine is aggression and its philosophy is expansion.

115. This explosive problem which has lasted so long constitutes a challenge to the international community in general and to the major Powers in particular, as well as to international legitimacy represented by the United Nations. The time has come to solve it, to put an end to injustice and to begin to restore what is right. The solution of this problem can bring about stability and peace in the Middle East and strengthen world peace and stability.

116. Mr. ALIAS (Malaysia): In our many years of discussion on this item, for the overwhelming majority of us here in the Assembly there is no doubt in our minds that unless the question of Palestine is satisfactorily resolved there can be little hope for peace in the Middle East. By definition, a comprehensive solution must include the restoration of all Arab lands which Israel has acquired through its wars of aggression since 1967 and, equally paramount, the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to self-determination and to their own homeland. Indeed, there can be no doubt that the question of Palestine constitutes the core of the problem in the Middle East. As long as the problem is allowed to languish, there can be no end to the climate of conflict which has hovered over the region for so long and which on several occasions has led the world to the brink of disaster.

117. None can accuse the United Nations of lack of trying, for over the last four decades a large number of resolutions have been adopted in our search for an end to the conflict. Many of the resolutions contain elements which could pave the way for peace. However, Israel has chosen to ignore all pronouncements of the international community and has refused to abandon the path of aggression and force. Israel is encouraged in its intransigence and open defiance through the protection and active sympathy of a single major Power, justified by consideration of Israel's survival and absolute strategic necessity. At all costs, right or wrong, Israel must be protected, even if it chooses to bite the hand that feeds it. The situation is comparable to a *carte blanche* which is continually extended to a chronic embezzler even if it proves the ruination of us all.

118. Hence, it is no mystery that the United Nations has thus far been unable to convince Israel that the best course for it and, indeed, for the security of the world is through a comprehensive settlement, fair to all, including the Palestinian people. For how can Israel justify its right to exist while denying the same to others? How can Israel continue to deny the reality of the Palestinian people? Notwithstanding the partition of Palestine and the dispossession of a whole people; in spite of their dispersal and the indignities of having to live as refugees; despite the awesome ferocity of Israel's military might unleashed on them; despite all that, the people of Palestine have steadfastly refused to disavow their common heritage as Palestinians. Surely, the Palestinians have proved beyond question that they are a people entitled to their own nation. Truly, the Palestinians embody the spirit of man, which under the yoke of tyranny grows in resoluteness rather than crumbles.

119. The report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*ibid.*] once again reveals Israel's complete disrespect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The Tel Aviv régime continues unabated in its policy of annexation of Arab lands through eviction and a variety of coercive measures, implanting Jewish settlers among the indigenous population. While new Jewish settlements are being established, existing settlements are being enlarged. Israel also plans to extend its legislation to the occupied territory. The report states:

> "Longer-term trends are ominous . . . indications are that the Israeli Government will continue to establish settlements in the occupied territories aiming at a projected minimum of 100,000 Israelis in such settlements by 1987 and 190,000 by the year 2010. The numbers exclude Israelis in East Jerusalem and other Palestinian localities incorporated into the city immediately after the 1967 war." [*Ibid., para. 28.*]

120. The Jewish settlers, who are issued firearms by the Israeli authorities, frequently intimidate and harass the local population. The most recent example of atrocities committed by Jewish terrorists is the attack on a bus carrying Arabs, resulting in one death and many injuries. Subsequently, two Arab student demonstrators were killed and many more injured by the Israeli military. Places of religious worship have been desecrated by Jewish terrorist groups.

121. The list of Israeli practices against the inalienable rights of Palestinians goes on. In the interest of brevity, I shall not attempt to state them all; the report is there for all to read. Suffice it to say that the thrust of Israel's policy is further to disperse the Palestinian people and render their situation so disagreeable that they will choose to leave, thus furthering Israel's objective of annexing the occupied territories.

122. I submit that, despite the seeming inability of the international community to dissuade Israel from continuing the present course, and despite Israel's complete disrespect for the many United Nations resolutions, it remains the sacred duty of the Assembly to continue in its efforts to seek justice for the Palestinian people. It is particularly incumbent upon us to persevere in our efforts for a comprehensive settlement, given that an indefinite continuation of the conflict situation in the Middle East may pass the point of restraint, as it has threatened to do on several occasions, with dire consequences for us all.

123. My Government's commitment to a comprehensive and just settlement, which should include the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to their

own independent homeland, was illustrated in Malaysia's willingness to host the Asian Regional Preparatory Meeting, held at Kuala Lumpur in May 1983, which was one of the steps which led to the convening of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983. My Government fully supports the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights, adopted by that conference,[1] as well as the proposal for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East, which was endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C. It is the fervent belief of my delegation that such a conference with the participation of the United States, the Soviet Union and all parties directly involved with the conflict, including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, would lead to a just solution. My delegation notes with deep concern in the reports of the Secretary-General [*A/39/130 and Add.1*] that his efforts for the convening of such a conference has not come to fruition. We appeal to the United States to reconsider its decision not to participate, recognizing that the United States has a central role to play, without which no meaningful result can be achieved.

124. We believe that within the confines of such a conference rests the possibility of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement, fair to all parties. To reject such an opportunity outright is to encourage further the intransigence of Israel; to refuse to recognize the legitimacy of the PLO is to deny the aspirations and the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and their own homeland.

125. We congratulate the Secretary-General on his efforts and urge him to continue his consultations despite the obstacles in his way.

126. Before concluding, my delegation would be remiss if it did not compliment the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Sarré, who has worked tirelessly and with such distinction. His commitment to a just solution to the Palestinian question is known to us all, and his dedication is an inspiration to all in the Committee. My delegation reiterates our continued support for Mr. Sarré and the Committee.

127. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, I warmly welcome the delegation of the PLO that is attending this session of the General Assembly. It represents here the heroic Palestinian people, which is waging a courageous and selfless struggle for the exercise of its inalienable national rights.

128. The question of ensuring the exercise by the Arab people of Palestine of their inalienable national rights is the core of a Middle East settlement. The Palestine problem has been constantly on the agenda of the General Assembly and of other international forums. Numerous United Nations resolutions, including those adopted at previous Assembly sessions, reaffirm the need for the exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate, inalienable rights, including the right of return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish its own State. In those resolutions, also, the right of the PLO to participate on an equal footing in the solution of all questions relating to the Middle East is recognized. But, despite all those decisions, including General Assembly resolution 181 (II), the Palestine problem remains unsolved. The Palestinian people is still deprived of a homeland and of its State and is forced to wander in exile or to languish under the oppressive yoke of Israeli military occupation. It is denied the exercise of its inalienable right to self-determination and to the creation of its own State.

129. The reasons for this situation are well known. They lie first and foremost in the aggressive, expansionist policy of Israel, a policy directed against Arab countries and peoples; in its illegal occupation of Arab lands, including Palestinian lands which it seized in 1967; and in its stubborn refusal to restore the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

130. As is attested to by the reports of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*A/39/35*] and the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practice Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [*A/39/591*], as well as by other documents submitted for consideration at the present session of the General Assembly, Israel—in violation of many Security Council and General Assembly resolutions—continues to follow a policy of annexation of the Arab territories it has occupied, including the Palestinian territories, and has been expanding the network of militarized settlements, thereby stifling the economic activity of the Arab population, depriving it of its political, social, civil and educational rights and destroying its cultural heritage.

131. As is noted in the letter dated 26 November 1984 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the Secretary-General: "Israel is increasingly resorting to drastic repressive measures in order to stifle any expression of opposition to its illegal occupation of the Palestinian territories" *see A/39/692*]. Racism reigns in the occupied Arab territories.

132. The outrageous acts perpetrated by Israeli terrorists against Palestinians have now acquired such dimensions that Tel Aviv is forced, in order to mislead public opinion, to officially take some measures to try to save face. But what kind of measures are they? I shall quote from a statement by Felicia Langer, the Vice-President of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights, in connection with the trial of members of the recently discovered anti-Arab terrorist group:

> "The sentences are simply ridiculous. One of the terrorists was given one and one half years—and he had transported 40 mines to be set to explode in a crowded mosque. Their hands are already bloodstained. They have killed Arab students and Palestinian mayors—and they get one and one half years. And, on the West Bank, a new law decrees that small Arab boys who throw stones at the occupiers be given sentences of 10 to 20 years."

133. Who are these terrorists? Why does the police treat them like heroes? Why are they given privileged conditions even in prison? The answer is simple—both simple and frightening: they belong to the Gush Emunim movement, zealous advocates of the colonization of the occupied lands. That means that they are the Likud's flesh and blood.

134. It is perfectly obvious that the aggressive policy of Israel, especially as it affects the Arab people of Palestine, would be impossible without the

comprehensive support of its strategic ally, the United States. This is in fact the major obstacle to a solution to the entire problem of the Middle East and of its core, the question of Palestine.

135. For example, the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, speaking last July at Tunis, stated:

> "The Israeli leadership perpetrates all of its crimes thanks to the full support of Washington. Taking advantage of the favourable attitude of the United States, Israel violates international principles, continues its occupation of Arab lands and escalates active aggression carried out against neighbouring countries. It expels the Arab population from their own lands and by force and terrorism imposes the policy of expansion of Israeli settlements; and carries out 'Judaization' of Arab cities and historic sites."

136. In June of this year, *The Washington Post* wrote:

> "Can one imagine another country, an ally of the United States, which, having decided to embark on a policy of irresponsible adventurism, would not have been subject to severe retaliation from Washington? But after all of its actions, Israel began to receive ever-increased aid from the United States. For that country we have a 'double standard'."

137. The reason for such generosity and for such a policy is simple. Tel Aviv assists Washington in achieving the establishment of its domination in the Middle East.

138. The policy and practical actions of the United States and Israel in the Middle East once again clearly demonstrate the aggressive nature of the so-called strategic alliance of the forces of imperialism and Zionism, which aspire not only to block the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, but also to remove the question of Palestine, once and for all, from the agenda by isolating the Arabs and forcing them thus to capitulate to the aggressor.

139. In this connection, what is of the greatest significance is the strengthening of co-operation between the Palestinian resistance movement and the national patriotic forces with Arab countries and, first and foremost, with those that are in the front lines of resistance to the aggressive intentions of the United States and Israel in the Middle East.

140. The most recent events in the Middle East emphasize yet once again the fruitlessness of the so-called separatist approach to a decision on the problem of the Middle East. This is a policy followed by Washington which consists in forcing each Arab country to come to an agreement separately and, moreover, in so doing ignoring the vital interests of the Palestinians. Historic experience convinces us that by following such a policy, it is impossible to defuse the situation in the Middle East and to provide its peoples with lasting peace.

141. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, in accordance with the programme for peace for the 1980s, adopted by the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, consistently and firmly stands by the victims of imperialist aggression and favours the elimination of conflict situations and a settlement of thorny problems and crises, *inter alia*, in the Middle East.

142. The proposals of the Soviet Union for a Middle East settlement of 29 July 1984 [*A/39/368*] give both an overview and a summary of those initiatives which have been taken by our country at various stages of the development of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It states the principles and means for achieving a settlement in the Middle East.

143. The Soviet proposal for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties involved, has won broad approval and support throughout the world. And only two States, the United States and Israel, actively oppose the holding of such a conference.

144. It is perfectly obvious that the sooner Washington and Tel Aviv show an attitude of responsibility and common sense which can prevail over the considerations of the moment, the better, for the gloomy experience of decades has demonstrated that neither a policy of military conflicts nor a policy of separate deals can possibly bring peace to the Middle East or ensure the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine. That can be done only as the result of peaceful negotiations on a collective basis, with the participation of all the parties involved. It is precisely such an approach to a solution of the problem of the Middle East which is actively favoured by the Soviet Union, the socialist States and many other countries.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[2] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[3] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[4] *Ibid., Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15403, annex.

[5] *Ibid.*, document S/15317.

[6] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1980*, document S/14268.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

89th PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 6 December 1984, at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind representatives that, in accordance with the decision taken this morning [*88th meeting*], the list of speakers in the debate on agenda item 33 will be closed tomorrow, 7 December, at 12 noon.

2. Mr. FERM (Sweden): A few days ago the Assembly was discussing the situation in the Middle East. During the debate many delegations expressed their firm conviction that the question of Palestine remains the core of the conflict in that part of the world. That is also the view held by the Swedish Government.

3. Countless efforts have been made within the United Nations during the past several decades in the pursuit of a peaceful solution to the problem, and rightly, because this question touches upon fundamental aspects of peace and security, of international law and of humanitarian principles.

4. To put it simply, we are discussing the claims of two peoples to the same geographical area. We know the arguments; they have been put forward by the two sides during this session of the General Assembly, as they have so many times in the past. All sides in the conflict say that they want peace, and we do not doubt that. The question is: What price are the parties prepared to pay for that peace? Is Israel prepared to give up its territorial claims and withdraw from the occupied territories? Is the Arab side willing to accept the Israeli State and acknowledge its right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries?

5. We hope that the voice of reason and compromise will eventually prevail in the region and that the answers to these questions will be in the affirmative.

6. The corner-stone of a fair and peaceful solution is already laid. The main elements are present in a few essential resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 recognized the national rights of the two peoples concerned and provided the legal foundation for two sovereign States in mandated Palestine. The 37 years that have elapsed since then have seen many changes and dramatic developments, including five major wars in the region. It would not be realistic, therefore, to attempt to revive and implement the letter of that resolution. Nevertheless, the basic concept of resolution 181 (II) remains valid. Indeed, the United Nations has a special responsibility to pursue a solution that gives the Palestinians themselves a real opportunity to fulfil their national aspirations. It is not for us to tell the Palestinians how they should exercise their right to self-determination, nor is it for Israel or any other country to dictate these matters.

7. In important respects, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) provide an adequate basis for negotiations towards a comprehensive settlement. My Government's understanding of the essential thrust of those two resolutions is that as a result of negotiations Israel would withdraw from the territories occupied in 1967. Israel's neighbours would give full recognition to Israel's right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

8. It is clear that a comprehensive settlement cannot be arrived at without the direct participation of the principal parties, including Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*], as well as those Arab States that are directly affected. The strategic realities make it essential that the major Powers should be party to such negotiations. A possible forum for the negotiations was indicated in the call by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, for an international peace conference, a call confirmed by the General Assembly. The United Nations provides appropriate machinery in the search for a solution to the conflict.

9. My Government views with serious concern some of the ongoing developments in the Middle East. The prospects for the eventual fulfilment of Palestinian national aspirations have suffered severe set-backs during the last few years. The continued Israeli policy of illegal settlements and various repressive measures directed against the Palestinian population in the West Bank and Gaza must be condemned.

10. Israel and some Arab countries have made obvious attempts to influence political processes among the Palestinians. The primary aim of such actions has apparently been either to eliminate the PLO as the leading Palestinian political force or to manipulate that organization's policies and leadership. My Government regards such attempts as harmful to the prospects for a lasting peace in the region.

11. A cause of concern continues to be the situation of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. The responsibility for the safety of the Palestinians living in southern

Lebanon rests for the moment with Israel as the occupying Power. Likewise, Syria must assume responsibility for the welfare of those refugees who live in areas under Syrian control.

12. My Government hopes that the talks in Naqoura will eventually lead to the long-overdue Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon. The responsibility for the protection of civilians will then be assumed by the Government of Lebanon. Should the Government of Lebanon seek assistance in order to fulfil its obligations in this regard, the international community should consider it its duty to render such assistance as may be possible.

13. The list of victims of this long conflict grows each day. Soldiers, innocent civilians and seekers of peace alike have shed their blood. It is 36 years now since my own countryman, Folke Bernadotte, gave his life for the dream of peace. That is too long and there has been too much blood. The negotiating table has been empty for too long.

14. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again the question of Palestine is before the General Assembly, where it has been considered in regular and special sessions since the founding of the United Nations.

15. It has taken on the characteristics of the problems for the solution of which the international community has looked to the United Nations as a forum that would establish peace and security in the world and achieve economic and social development for the benefit of all mankind.

16. Hence, discussion of the question of Palestine in the United Nations makes possible a better awareness of the Organization and of the way in which it deals with problems and obstacles that prevent it from implementing its resolutions. The will of the United Nations is but the collective expression of all its Member States. Had the international will been exercised with respect to this problem which has been with us for such a long time without any practical solution, it would no longer be so difficult to find a just and lasting solution.

17. Although the problem has many ramifications and various elements, it is obvious that a people has been driven out of its land by force but that it remains determined to regain its homeland. It has expressed this determination by all legitimate means recognized in the norms of international law. No people in the world has shown such determination without the international community having acted favourably on its behalf and supported its right to self-determination as a first step towards independence and sovereignty. The people of Palestine is no exception to this rule. It is the repository of a desire which is upheld by all peoples of the world that cherish peace and freedom.

18. International law recognizes the right of the Palestinian people to return to their families, their homes and their land. Furthermore, the United Nations made a pledge to the Palestinian people in 1947 and has reaffirmed year after year its right to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State on its ancestral land.

19. The position of my Government on the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine has not changed. That position was confirmed by our Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in his statement to the General Assembly on 5 October 1984 when he said:

> "Given that situation, it is necessary to intensify our efforts to observe more strictly the international legal norms and the principles and Charter of the United Nations, and to respect and implement the Organization's resolutions. The United Nations is the only organization capable of ridding mankind of the spectre of chaos, war and hunger.
>
> "The Assembly's agenda is composed of numerous, complicated items requiring concerted action by all countries of the world. Perhaps one of the most important and complex matters that have faced the Organization since its establishment is the question of the Palestinian people. It is now high time for Israel to understand that the only road to peace is through dialogue and negotiation, leading to a just solution that will restore the dignity of the Palestinian people and ensure their legitimate right to self-determination, including the right to establish their own independent State. Israel must also understand that resort to the use of force cannot guarantee its peace or security. It will not be able to achieve stability or ensure its interests if it persists in ignoring the interests of the Palestinians and continues to violate the sovereignty and security of neighbouring States.
>
> "Israel's rejection of the various peace initiatives and its frustration of all attempts to solve the Palestinian question make it responsible for the state of war and tension prevailing in the Middle East.
>
> "The Sultanate of Oman, which has supported all the efforts of those who seek peace in the region and work to achieve it, endorses the Geneva Declaration on Palestine calling for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, in which all the interested parties would participate. The endorsement by the General Assembly, at its last session, of the guidelines of the Geneva Declaration calling for the attainment by the Palestinian people of their inalienable, legitimate rights is an important step in the context of international efforts to achieve a political settlement of this conflict. We understand full well, however, that no conference will succeed without the participation of all the parties concerned.
>
> "We consider the Palestinian-Jordanian *rapprochement*, as evidenced by the continued and intensified bilateral talks, to be a positive and encouraging factor for mobilizing the Arab efforts and setting the stage for decisive action aimed at achieving a political solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict." [*23rd meeting, paras. 125-129.*]

20. The international community is duty-bound to support the legitimacy of the Palestinian people as represented by the PLO and the national institutions of the Palestinian people. The PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians who are continuing their struggle.

21. We are very pleased at the success of the Palestine National Council, which recently met at Amman and which reaffirmed the strength and wisdom of the enlightened national leadership of the Palestinian people.

22. We wish to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his role and for his sustained efforts, as borne out in his reports to the General Assembly and the Security Council [*A/39/130 and Add.1*].

23. We appreciate the specific efforts made by the many international committees under United Nations auspices, especially those of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and the efforts made in commemorating the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, which is observed each year on 29 November. Similarly, we pay a tribute to the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories and to other United Nations and international bodies.

24. We hope that the international community will continue to search for a just solution of the Palestinian problem, and we believe that that would also resolve the question of other Arab territories under Israeli occupation, so that a just and lasting peace may prevail in the Middle East and all the inhabitants of that important region of the world may live in peace and harmony. We must also seek to put an end to the chronic international problems in the world today which result in destruction everywhere.

25. Our concerted action to bring about a solution to the problem of Palestine will benefit the entire international community without exception.

26. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): We are once again considering the question of Palestine, an item which has remained intractably on the agenda of the General Assembly for several decades now. Recent years have witnessed great vicissitudes in the plight of the Palestinian people and their brave struggle for national independence. A valiant people continue to remain deprived of their homes. Their lands, even beyond those defined by the United Nations at the time of the partition of Palestine, have been forcibly occupied. Numerous resolutions on the subject adopted by the United Nations remain unimplemented. Israel continues forcibly to occupy Arab lands and to thwart the will of the international community. Israel is also vigorously continuing with the policy of establishing settlements in the West Bank. As a result, the entire region of western Asia is in the grip of constant turmoil and tension with a possibility of their escalation into a wider, all-encompassing conflict.

27. Recent developments in the Middle East have introduced even more complex and dangerous elements into an already complicated situation. Israel's continued occupation of Lebanon in defiance of Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), its harassment and intimidation of the Palestinian and Lebanese people, the dispersal of Palestinians against their will into neighbouring States and Israel's policy of establishing new settlements are part of its policy seeking to consolidate its stranglehold over the occupied Arab territories and to annex them.

28. India's own sympathy for the people of Palestine and support for the establishment of a Palestinian State are rooted in our awareness of the historical, territorial and national identity of the Palestinians. Even during the days of our struggle for national independence, our leaders identified themselves with the Palestinian cause and raised their voices in support of the establishment of an independent Palestinian homeland. The continuing struggle of the brave Palestinians evokes sympathy and understanding among the people of India to this day. The decision to partition Palestine was taken in the same year as India became independent. India secured its independence, but the people of Palestine were banished from their own lands. Many countries since then have also become free and are now masters of their own destinies. However, the Palestinians not only remain homeless, but even more of their lands have since been occupied. As the late Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, recalled in her closing address to the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983:

> "millions are still denied their birthright—for instance, the Palestinians, Namibians and the people of South Africa. His Excellency Chairman Yasser Arafat and His Excellency Chairman Sam Nujoma have honoured us with their presence. Yet they are barred from their own homes."[1]

29. India has consistently advocated that a just and comprehensive solution to the problems of western Asia should comprise the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national and human rights, including the right to establish an independent State in their homeland, the total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and a guarantee for all States in the region, including Palestine, to live within secure and recognized borders. In our view, the Palestinians have a right to return to their homes and property in Palestine, from which they have been mercilessly displaced and uprooted. Their right to self-determination should be exercised without any external interference and, like other States in the region, the State of Palestine should be enabled to live in peace and security and follow its own domestic and foreign policies. An essential prerequisite for the attainment of a peaceful solution is the full and equal participation of the PLO, the only genuine representative of the Palestinian people, in any discussions relating to their future and, indeed, the future of the entire region.

30. The efforts by the international community to find a comprehensive solution of the problem of the Middle East, the core of which is the question of Palestine, received a fresh impetus at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983. General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, adopted by an overwhelming majority last year, endorsed the Geneva Declaration on Palestine[2] and its call for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. The Geneva Declaration had envisaged that the proposed peace conference, to be convened under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of all the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO, as well as the United States, the Soviet Union and other concerned States, on an equal footing, would take as its basis the internationally recognized guidelines endorsed at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine.

31. It will be recalled that resolution 38/58 C requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Security Council, urgently to undertake preparatory measures to convene the conference and to report on his efforts no later than 15 March 1984. We are indeed grateful to the Secretary-General for initiating a process of consultations, in pursuance of resolution 38/58 C, with the members of the Security Council and with other concerned States for the convening of the proposed peace conference. In our

own response [*see A/39/227*] to the Secretary-General's letter of 9 March 1984, the Government of India conveyed its broad agreement with the plan of action proposed by the Secretary-General. However, we suggested that some flexibility be retained in the selection of participants for the conference. In the time-frame for the convening of the conference, it was our view that the situation in western Asia did not brook any delay and that urgent preparatory measures should be undertaken so that the conference could be convened at the earliest possible time.

32. While most of the States consulted have indicated their agreement to the proposed peace conference, we deeply regret that some others have not found it possible to do so. In his report on the situation in the Middle East, the Secretary-General stated that:

> "The history of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East and of the Palestine question has thus been a long record of missed opportunities punctuated by wars and violence that have only served to complicate the situation further and to create new misery and new obstacles to peace." [*See A/39/600, para. 42.*]

Indeed the time has come to pursue with determination our search for ways and means to remedy the injustice done to the Palestinian people and to find an early solution to the tragic conflict. The negative attitude of a handful of States to the proposed peace conference has led the Secretary-General to conclude in his report that "the conditions required for convening the proposed conference with any chance of success are not met at the present time" [*ibid., para. 40*].

33. Time is of the essence, and delay does not facilitate a solution of the problem in the Middle East. We therefore view with interest, as an interim measure, the proposal of the Secretary-General, contained in his report, "of using the machinery of the Security Council in a new way to work with the parties concerned on various aspects of the Middle East problem and to distil from the various proposals and plans that have been put forward in recent years the common elements that could help work out the basis of a negotiating structure" [*ibid., para. 45*]. It is important that a process of negotiations be initiated, the Secretary-General said, "to clear the ground and to prepare for a full-fledged effort to negotiate the problem" [*ibid.*].

34. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has, since its inception, consistently advocated a comprehensive solution to the question of Palestine, the core of the Middle East problem and the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is at the initiative of the non-aligned countries that the majority of United Nations resolutions on the subject have been adopted. In the past year, the non-aligned countries have been particularly active in mobilizing international support against Israeli action in occupied territories and its invasion of Lebanon. The non-aligned countries have also reaffirmed their firm opposition to the Israeli practices and policies in occupied Arab and Palestinian territories and called for the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Syrian Golan Heights. At the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, this question was exhaustively examined. Fundamental principles for the solution of the problem were again reaffirmed. The heads of State or Government affirmed

> "that a just and durable peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by it since 1967, including Jerusalem, and without the achievement of a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment and exercise in Palestine of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right . . . to establish the Palestinian independent State in its homeland, Palestine."[3]

35. The Non-Aligned Committee of Eight on Palestine, set up by the New Delhi Conference to "work with the various forces influential in the Middle East conflict for the achievement of a just, durable and comprehensive peace in the Middle East,"[4] has endeavoured during the year to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it by the Conference. The Committee of Eight has maintained its contacts with representatives of various States and with the Secretary-General to pursue the goal of the early convening of the peace conference. The search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and active support for and solidarity with our Palestinian brothers has been a fundamental feature of our Movement. The Committee of Eight met in October 1984 at ministerial level and decided to continue its active role in this direction and to spare no effort in support of the inalienable rights of the Arab Palestinian people, in accordance with international law and the will of the non-aligned countries and their peoples.

36. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, India has fully supported the Committee in its efforts to secure the rights of the Palestinian people and to promote their cause. The report of the Committee [*A/39/35*] bears testimony to its untiring efforts under the dedicated leadership of Mr. Sarré, of Senegal. Though the basic recommendations of the Committee have remained unimplemented so far, its activities during the year have served to increase the support of the international community for the cause of Palestine.

37. It is well known that the primary reason for the lack of progress in finding a comprehensive solution is the arrogance and intransigence of Israel, which has deliberately defied the will of the international community, as well as the lack of political will on the part of some important Member States. We appeal to all members of the international community to display statesmanship and join in the effort to find a speedy and just solution to the problem based on the principles enunciated by the United Nations and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We urge them, as a first urgent step, to strive for the discontinuance of the Israeli settlements policy and to call for an immediate freeze on new settlements and the dismantling of those already established. At the same time, continued Israeli occupation of Lebanon is totally unacceptable. We all want to see a sovereign, independent and united Lebanon. This calls for the withdrawal of all foreign forces. Side by side, increased and sustained efforts and an initiation of a new process towards a just, durable and comprehensive settlement of the question of Palestine through peaceful means has become a matter of highest priority.

38. We listened with great attention to the important statement made this morning by Mr. Kaddoumi, Head of the Political Department of the Palestine

Liberation Organization [*88th meeting*]. We welcome the recent meeting of the Palestine National Council, held at Amman, and have noted the decisions taken at that meeting. This has demonstrated the staunch will of the Palestinians to continue their just struggle for the attainment of their legitimate rights, and we wish them every success.

39. In conclusion, may I recall the words of the late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in her keynote address to the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983:

> "We are of one mind in our support for the brave, homeless and much harassed Palestinian people. Israel feels free to commit any outrage, unabashed in its aggression, unrepentant about its transgressions of international law and behaviour. But can it for ever obstruct the legitimate rights of Palestinians?"[5]

40. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Ten years ago the General Assembly took a historic decision solemnly recognizing the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, declaring the PLO to be its sole legitimate representative and identifying the Palestinian problem as the core of the conflict in the Middle East.

41. The General Assembly, by committing itself to the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and abandoning the erroneous path it had followed until then, which reduced the Middle East crisis to a question of the consequences of the Zionist régime's policy of aggression against the peoples of that region, undertook to redress a historic injustice for which it was itself responsible and to take up again its original task as an organization representing an act of faith for all oppressed peoples, and, in the final analysis, it became reconciled with itself.

42. This was the result of a long march lasting a quarter of a century and of a heroic struggle during which the Palestinian people, because of an international conspiracy which had deprived it of its land, its goods and its rights, paid a heavy price for its freedom, its dignity and its right to a national and independent existence on its own land. Thus the thick veil which had for long concealed the condition of the Palestinian people was lifted and the Palestinian national reality forced itself on the universal conscience as an undeniable reality and a necessary element in any just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem. At the same time, the world discovered that what some people had shamelessly tried to present as a citadel of besieged freedom was in reality no more than a war machine based on a racist, expansionist philosophy which boasted of perpetuating the denial of the right to exist of an entire people.

43. Ten years have passed since this historic rehabilitation and the Palestinian people continues, as in the past, to endure the calvary of exile or that of occupation in its own homeland. Its land remains occupied, its freedom denied, its right to exist challenged.

44. In their camps where the collective memory of a nation that refuses to give in grows stronger, clinging to what remains of its ancestral land in occupied Palestine, the Palestinian people continues undaunted its march through history and its struggle for its existence and its identity, strengthened by the justness of its cause and by its unshakeable conviction that right will triumph in the end.

45. Since the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, many victories have been won, however, and the elements of a just and comprehensive settlement have little by little become accepted and were endorsed by the General Assembly, which, at its seventh emergency special session, forcefully proclaimed: first, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to independence and to national sovereignty, as well as the right to establish its own independent sovereign State in Palestine; secondly, the inalienable right of the displaced and uprooted Palestinians to return to their homes and recover their property in Palestine; thirdly, the right of the PLO, as the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing in the search for a just solution to the Palestine problem; and, fourthly, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

46. The General Assembly having shouldered its responsibilities, it was then for the Security Council to act in harmony with the Assembly and take the decisions that could guarantee the effective exercise by the Palestinian people of its national rights. But the abuse of the veto by a super-Power, by keeping the Council dangerously immobile, totally blocked all the efforts and reduced all the chances for peace to nought.

47. Indeed, it has been the many kinds of assistance furnished to the Zionist régime by that very super-Power that have enabled that régime, which has been given the role of a staging point of imperialism in a particularly sensitive region of the world, to pursue its policy of aggression against the peoples of the Middle East, to build up its deadly war machine and to continue to show arrogant contempt for United Nations decisions and the international community's injunctions.

48. The recent rejection by the Zionist leaders of the idea of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East, when all the Arab States concerned had stated their readiness to participate in such a conference; the increase in repression and the Israeli presence in the occupied territories, in particular by the establishment of new settlements; the continued occupation of southern Lebanon; the refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions: all these are manifestations of Zionist expansionism. They would not have been possible without the support which the Zionist régime gets and the impunity it enjoys.

49. Thus, in the occupied Arab territories, the policy of zionization continues methodically and implacably. The repression of the Arab populations is growing and intensifying. Strengthened and bolstered by fanatic bands enjoying the unconditional support of some religious and political circles, the occupation forces have imposed a reign of terror in occupied Palestine.

50. The many forms and consequences of all this extortion and institutionalized terror are described in detail in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [*A/39/591*]. That is how the Zionist régime continues its sinister undertaking of de-Arabizing Palestinian territory once and for all, by uprooting the Arabs from their homes and establishing more and more

settlements—showing utter contempt for international condemnation—and transferring enormous numbers of Israeli settlers to the occupied territories, with a view to their final annexation.

51. In Lebanon, despite imperative resolutions adopted unanimously by the Security Council, the Israeli occupation is becoming more unbearable every day. A sovereign country that is a Member of the United Nations continues to witness a part of its territory occupied, its people oppressed, its unity broken, its economy thrown out of joint by a war that was imposed on it.

52. The Syrian Golan Heights, "annexed" by an unprecedented act of legislative piracy, continues to suffer inadmissible attacks on its identity and its Arab nature.

53. The Arab States of the region, constantly exposed to brutal aggression and the insatiable appetite of the Zionist régime for territory, remain the victims of unending threats and blackmail.

54. It is an undeniable fact that certain peace efforts have so far been fruitless because, instead of attacking what is still the crux of the matter—that is, the Palestinian national reality—they have turned a blind eye to this reality, preferring to deal with certain phenomena which, however serious they may be, are only the consequences of the Zionist régime's policy of aggression and expansionism and whose solution therefore cannot constitute a final settlement of the Middle East problem.

55. The only path that could lead to a just and comprehensive settlement of this bloody conflict is one that would enable the Palestinian people to exercise all its inalienable national rights and would guarantee respect for the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

56. In this respect, again, the responsibility must be shouldered by the Security Council, the body entrusted with the formidable task of maintaining international peace and security. By acting in harmony with the General Assembly and resolutely undertaking to work to give concrete form to the international consensus on the Middle East, the Security Council will regain its credibility, its effectiveness and its authority.

57. For its part, Algeria will continue to lend its full support to the heroic struggle of the Palestinian people and to work for the unity, cohesion and independence of the decision-making of its resistance, until all the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people are finally restored to them. Fortified by the experience of its own liberation struggle, Algeria remains convinced that, with regained unity and the mobilization of the entire Palestinian resistance around a common, mutually accepted platform, the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, will be able to strengthen its capacities and means of action and fulfil all the deep aspirations of the Palestinian people.

58. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): For more than four decades, the question of Palestine has been, and unfortunately continues to be, of deep concern to the international community.

59. In this matter, the United Nations plays a primary role, inherited from the League of Nations and also bequeathed to it by the British Government which held the Mandate over Palestine and which, on 18 February 1947, stated that it was "faced with a conflict of irreconcilable principles" and that "the only thing remaining for it to do was to submit the problem to the judgement of the United Nations".

60. Since then, the international community has been constantly involved in the Palestine question—initially, because it endorsed, by General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, the Plan of Partition that formalized the injustice committed against the Palestinian people; and, subsequently, because it had been unable over the years, despite all the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, to bring about the solution that was sought.

61. The reasons for that, of course, are many and varied, but the responsibility of the United Nations, stemming from its Charter, remains entire.

62. In the report he addressed, two days before his assassination, to the Secretary-General, Count Folke Bernadotte wrote:

> "It would be a dangerous illusion to believe that it would be possible to establish a State of Israel overnight without taking into account the underlying political considerations involved as they are understood in the modern interplay of politics among nations."

63. We all know the scenario that had been prepared, the pressure exerted and the steps taken from the end of the nineteenth century after the first meeting of the Zionist congress. There were various stages which were to lead to the achievement of the objectives laid down at that congress.

64. First of all there was the Balfour Declaration, which Sir Edward Montagu, the only Jewish member of the British Government at the time, himself denounced. That was followed by the implementation of the policy and practices of the Zionist organization on the basis of the slogan: "A land without people for a people without land."

65. The terror campaign of Haganah and the Stern and Irgun gangs were to do the rest. That campaign was denounced in the British Parliament by Sir Winston Churchill in the following terms:

> "If our dreams for zionism are to disappear in the smoke from assassins' pistols, and if our efforts to build a future for zionism are to bring forth a new generation of gangsters worthy of Nazi Germany, many of us, including myself, will have to go back on the positions we have taken."

Those are the words of Sir Winston Churchill.

66. Referring to the pressures and campaigns of which he himself was the target, former President Harry Truman of the United States wrote in his memoirs:

> "In fact, not only was the United Nations subjected to unprecedented pressure, but the White House also was itself the target of a veritable barrage. I believe I have never been the target of such a virulent campaign."

Those are the words of Harry Truman, former President of the United States.

67. Thus, in spite of all these facts, Israel was established; but no restraint was placed upon its aggrandizement and no safeguards or guarantees were established for the rights of the Palestinian people, the victims of one of the worst injustices of the twentieth century.

68. The expulsion of the Palestinians from their homes and their land has been a long-standing Israeli

policy. It became a systematic policy of Israel from the time of its creation. Ben Gurion described the ultimate objective as that of "a purely Jewish and much larger State, thanks to Haganah".

69. From 1948 onwards, Israel has striven to impede the implementation of the territorial provisions of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, to strengthen its hold on the territories it controlled and to thwart resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948.

70. Since 1948, the Palestinian people have been condemned to dispersion and wandering. This situation deteriorated dangerously in 1967, after the military occupation of what remained of Palestinian territory and the implementation of the Israeli strategic plans with regard to the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip and the eastern part of Al-Quds al-Sharif.

71. Studies and analyses carried out by the relevant United Nations organs on Israel's policies and practices in the occupied Palestinian territories concur with regard to the racist, colonialist and expansionist nature of Israel.

72. Ever since its creation, Israel has pursued simply a policy of *fait accompli*, violation of the rights of the Palestinian people and defiance of the international community and the United Nations, the organization to which it owes its very existence.

73. Invoking the theory of the chosen people, Israel intends to leave no room in a land it considers to be unpopulated except for Jews; and this aim is justified by every possible means, including the expulsion and deportation of Palestinians, whether they be Christians or Muslims; denial of their right to return to their homes and the land of their ancestors; arrests and ill-treatment of the civilian population; expropriations under the pretext of public utility or military security; demolition of houses and shelters; restraints on religious freedoms and practices; violation of respect for family rights and customs; the policy of Judaization, which does not even spare the holy places; the geographic and demographic transformation of towns and villages; and rules and laws imposed by Israel. These are all examples of the practices and the excesses of the Israelis in the occupied Palestinian territories.

74. As for Israel's colonialist and expansionist character, this is confirmed by the occupation and annexation of territories and the establishment of settlements in those territories and in towns such as Al-Quds and Al-Khalil.

75. The practice of Israel in the occupied Arab territories now consists of tightening the noose around the Arab habitation centres, swelling the settlements already established and creating others, so that, by 1987, 175 settlements will have been created, accommodating about 250,000 Jews.

76. In carrying out this policy of rampant expansionism, the Israeli leaders place stress on the fundamental strategic role of the settlements. They have stated more than once that these settlements strengthen Israel's security and provide a solid basis for its case for maintaining peace with defensible borders.

77. In defiance of international law and of United Nations resolutions, Israel persists in pursuing its policy of occupation, aggression, expansion and the establishment of illegal settlements not only throughout the Palestinian territories but also in Al-Quds, the status of which it is bent on changing.

78. In violation of Security Council resolution 478 (1980), which was adopted after the promulgation of the "Basic Law" by Israel, certain countries decided to transfer their embassies from Tel Aviv to Al-Quds. Such an illegal, scandalous measure could only encourage Israeli annexation and gravely compromise the general recognition of the special status of Al-Quds by the international community and the undertakings of the United Nations itself on this subject.

79. The Israeli practices in the establishment of settlements and violation of rules of law and international conventions, as well as fundamental human rights, have constantly been a source of profound concern to the international community. They are likely to become even worse as a result of the carrying out of the Ben Porat project relating to the reinstallation of Palestinian refugees, which would constitute, if put into effect, a further link in the chain of criminal actions against the Palestinians, designed to marginalize their struggle.

80. This whole policy, it is claimed, is carried out in the name of Israel's security, a concept largely belied by the various military adventures undertaken by Israel in the course of the past four decades.

81. In view of its offensive military potential and the commitments of its allies, Israel, far from being threatened, in actual fact is posing a constant threat to the Palestinians and their neighbours.

82. Rather than accepting the compromise offered to it many times, to settle the problem peacefully on the basis of international law, United Nations resolutions and recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people—the right of return, and the right to self-determination and the right to create its own independent State—Israel has systematically pursued a policy of rejection, obstruction and defiance, giving rise to constant tension in the Middle East and throughout the world.

83. The British historian Arnold Toynbee has written that: "The Palestinian tragedy is not just a local tragedy. It is a tragedy for the whole world, because it is an injustice which threatens the peace of the world."

84. In deciding in 1947 on the partition of Palestine, the United Nations recognized the right of the Palestinian people to sovereignty and to establish its own independent State.

85. Reduced to the level of a refugee people, it was forced to have recourse, under the guidance of its sole legitimate representative, the PLO, to armed struggle to assert its rights.

86. The United Nations did justice to the Palestinian people by recognizing fully and formally its inalienable right to self-determination without outside interference, to independence and to national sovereignty, as well as the right to return.

87. In 1974 the United Nations recognized the justice of the struggle of the Palestinian people, the central place of the Palestinian question in the Middle East conflict and the representative nature of the PLO.

88. But, true to the image it had always held and preferring the pursuit of its predetermined plans to the search for a just and lasting solution to the Palestinian problem, Israel not only closed the door

on a peaceful solution based on international law but engaged with even greater determination in an attempt to eliminate the Palestinian people and its representative, the PLO, in the hope of imposing its own partial and separate solutions and carrying out its hegemonist plans in Palestine and in the countries of the region.

89. In so doing, Israel reduced the chances of establishing peace in a region which had been ravaged by five wars. It pretends not to realize that no force, however sophisticated, can overcome the nationalism of a people determined to pursue its struggle to fulfil its aspirations to dignity, justice and freedom.

90. If the practices of the Nazis, the deportation camps and the cremation ovens stimulated and heightened Jewish nationalism, how could it be otherwise in the case of Palestinian nationalism? By a curious paradox, yesterday's victims have today become the butchers and the countries which yesterday defended the Jewish people are today, through their aid and assistance, encouraging Israel in its persecution of the Palestinian people.

91. In his message of 29 November 1984, on the occasion of the commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, President Habib Bourguiba expressed Tunisia's profound concern at the obstinacy and intransigence of Israel and reiterated our position on the Palestinian question. He said:

> "Reaffirming our commitment to the Arab peace plan adopted at the Fez summit, we believe that all international efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East deserve the support of all the members of the international community."

92. At its thirty-eighth session, in resolution 38/58 C, the General Assembly welcomed and endorsed the call for convening an international peace conference on the Middle East. We pay a sincere and well-deserved tribute to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to bring about this conference, but we must note that obstacles to convening it are continuously being created. While we are used to the Israeli attitude of rejection, obstinacy and intransigence, it is regrettable that certain countries which bear special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security continue to show reluctance about the convening of this conference.

93. The numerous peace initiatives of the past two years constitute a noteworthy contribution to the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Palestinian problem and to the problem of the Middle East. They testify to the imperative need, as we approach the end of the twentieth century, to put an end to a situation which not only is anachronistic but seriously threatens international peace and security.

94. Tunisia reaffirms its commitment to and support for any initiative which could lead to the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and a solution to the Middle East problem, and remains convinced that the convening of an international peace conference would be a step towards the beginning of a peace process in the region. The conference would have the advantage of the full backing of international law, would provide for the participation of all parties to the conflict, without any exception, and would constitute an appropriate framework for determining all the conditions for a comprehensive peace in the light of the relevant United Nations resolutions and the most recent proposals for comprehensive settlement.

95. In this way, the United Nations will have done its duty and fully shouldered its responsibilities regarding the solution of a conflict that has lasted for four decades. It seems to us that the time is ripe for such action.

96. In its determination to block the achievement of peace and the restoration to the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights, Israel is making a serious mistake in believing that it can perpetuate its supremacy in the region. It should understand that ultimately the balance of power will no longer be in its favour. In 10, 20 or 30 years, the Arab countries will have achieved a technological, military and human potential which could bring about fundamental changes in the situation.

97. On my country's behalf, I urge that all possible efforts be made to seize this new opportunity to solve the Middle East problem once and for all and to enable that region at last to enjoy the peace and security in which it can devote itself to development and to the progress of its peoples.

98. Next year the international community will celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. For all of us, that commemoration will provide an opportunity to reaffirm the noble ideals on which the United Nations was based and its Charter written. It will also inspire us to redouble our efforts to ensure the triumph of those ideals. That commemoration will be a sign of renewal for all those that have pinned their hopes on the United Nations and expect it to restore their rights. Let us hope that the international community will fully discharge its obligations to them and see to it that their aspirations are fulfilled in justice and peace.

99. If 1986 is to be declared a year of peace, it must not be so in words alone.

100. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the statements by the representatives of the PLO and some Arab countries. I wish to take this opportunity to voice our firm support and pay high tribute, in the name of the Chinese delegation, to the heroic Palestinian people who are fighting for the restoration of their national rights and the realization of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

101. The question of Palestine is the crux of the Middle East issue, having a direct bearing on the peace and stability of the Middle East. It is, in essence, a question of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples resisting Israeli aggression and expansion and fighting for the restoration of their national rights. In defiance of the norms of international law and relevant United Nations resolutions, the Israeli authorities have long trampled upon the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and have forcibly occupied large tracts of territories of neighbouring Arab countries on the pretext of Israel's right to security. They have always obdurately refused to recognize the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and to enter into a dialogue with the PLO. Their extreme arrogance and utter defiance of world opinion are inseparable from the connivance and backing of a super-Power. We hope that this super-Power will change its position of siding with Israel and make efforts towards achieving a fair and reasonable settlement of the Palestinian question.

Mr. Gumucio Granier (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

102. The heroic Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative, have waged long years of extremely arduous struggle against the Israeli aggressors, thus winning world-wide sympathy and support. The PLO, too, has gained recognition and support from an increasing number of countries.

103. It is 37 years since the United Nations started its consideration of the question of Palestine in 1947. In the past decade, the United Nations has adopted a series of resolutions upholding justice. In particular, General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) reaffirmed the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, and resolution 3375 (XXX) invited the PLO to participate in all efforts for the realization of peace in the Middle East. The Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[2] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, called for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations in conformity with the principles of the Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Other international organizations and countries have also put forward suggestions and proposals for a comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East problem. Of those proposals, the plan embodied in the Final Declaration adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference[6] merits particular mention, for it contains reasonable and realistic propositions and can form the basis for the settlement of the question.

104. China supports such reasonable suggestions and proposals and appraises highly the efforts made by the Arab countries and all the other justice-upholding countries for a settlement of the question of Palestine. I wish to reiterate that all efforts made on a similar basis that are conducive to the recovery by Arab countries of their lost territories, the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people and the achievement of a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East question will receive endorsement and support from the Chinese Government. China has held all along that the key to a settlement lies in the restoration to the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights, including the right to self-determination, the right to return to their homeland and the right to establish their own State in Palestine; and in Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Arab Jerusalem. The PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, has the right to participate on an equal footing with other parties. This is the only way to a comprehensive settlement and a fair solution of the Palestinian question, to the enjoyment of peace and of the right of all countries in the Middle East to existence and to the gradual realization of peace and stability in the region. We call on all peace-loving countries and peoples to make concerted efforts for an early and just settlement of the question of Palestine.

105. Mr. ENDREFFY (Hungary): My delegation had the opportunity a little while ago to take part in the deliberations on the situation in the Middle East. In our statement [*75th meeting*], we tried to focus attention on the larger context of the problem, the effects the unresolved issues in the Middle East have on the international situation. We were obliged to state with much regret that at the present time we are not a bit closer to a solution than we were a year ago. This implies that we did not make any progress either on the key issue of the Middle East crisis, that is, the Palestinian problem, which is the topic of our present statement.

106. The most fundamental human, political and national rights of the suffering Arab people of Palestine continue to be trampled underfoot. Israel continues to occupy Arab territories and with its aggressive, expansionist policy further complicates an already tense situation.

107. Throughout the year we have been confronted with reports on the continuation of the Israeli policy of establishing illegal Jewish settlements or enlarging those already existing in the occupied territories. This policy more often than not involves conflict and violence. The evacuation, deportation and expulsion of Arab inhabitants, the destruction and demolition of their homes and the confiscation of Arab property cannot be achieved otherwise. Often, Arab protests are followed by shooting and even killing or at best by mass arrests and the detention of the demonstrating Arabs.

108. Without going into further detail, let me just mention here that at its fortieth session, earlier this year, the Commission on Human Rights adopted no less than five resolutions dealing with the situation in the occupied Arab territories and condemning the Israeli policies and practices I have described.

109. And it is not only human rights that are denied the Palestinians. The Israeli policies designed to promote, protect and develop the illegal settlements have a direct economic effect on the Palestinian population as well, resulting in structural changes in the economy of the occupied territories.

110. We have repeatedly stated that the Israeli measures are clearly aimed at deliberately changing the geographical character, the demographic nature and even the legal status of the occupied territories, flagrantly violating the established norms of international law and specific United Nations resolutions.

111. This policy must not be allowed to go on. It has to be stopped, not only because it is lawless and inhuman, but also because it is dangerous; it perpetuates tension in the region with all its well-known adverse effects on international peace and security.

112. Israel cannot hope to achieve the much-desired peace through illegally occupying other people's territories. Its security cannot be exclusive. There can only be common security achieved through negotiations with all the parties involved in the conflict.

113. The overwhelming majority in the United Nations has consistently advocated a peaceful, political solution to the question of Palestine—and rightly, since there is no rational alternative.

114. The basic step in this direction should be recognition of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine: the right to self-determination, including the establishment of an independent sovereign State of their own; the right to return; the right to compensation; and so on.

115. The just settlement of the Palestinian problem, based on recognition of the rights to which I have referred, would constitute the most significant contribution to a comprehensive settlement of the whole Middle East question. It could be achieved by meeting the other well-known conditions of a settlement, namely: the withdrawal of Israeli forces from

all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the region, including Israel.

116. It goes without saying that all the parties concerned should take part in the process of settlement on an equal footing, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people. It is also generally recognized that the support of the major Powers, especially the Soviet Union and the United States, is essential if a lasting settlement is to be achieved.

117. It is obvious that renewed international efforts are needed to create the necessary conditions to set this process of settlement in motion and to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East.

118. We are well aware of the fact that there is a long and difficult road ahead of us.

119. It is necessary to improve the international climate so that it becomes more conducive to negotiations. It is also necessary to strengthen the unity of the Arab countries, as well as of the Palestinian movement, so that lack of unity cannot be used further to delay talks and negotiations. And it is also necessary for the parties concerned to be realistic. We agree with the Secretary-General when he states in his report:

> "It seems clear to me that none of the parties to this historic and tragic conflict can hope to attain its maximum demands if there is to be a state of real peace in the region. In the changes of fortune, the shifting balance of power and the inexorable development of underlying trends in the Middle East, no party can view the future with equanimity, nor will the world escape the repercussions of continuing violence in this unique area." [*A/39/600, para. 43.*]

120. Let us not allow this to happen. Rather, let us work together, both here in the United Nations and in our bilateral diplomacy, for a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the question of Palestine, for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

121. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Exactly 10 years have passed since the General Assembly, at its twenty-ninth session, adopted the fundamental resolution 3236 (XXIX). That resolution clearly set forth the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination without outside intervention and to national independence and sovereignty.

122. At subsequent sessions of the General Assembly, including the seventh emergency special session, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people were reaffirmed. Together with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, these resolutions constitute the generally recognized basis for a just solution to the problem of Palestine, within the framework of a comprehensive Middle East settlement, taking account of the legitimate interests both of the Arab people of Palestine and of the State of Israel.

123. However, the legitimate demands of the Palestinian people have not yet been implemented. The Arab people of Palestine continues to be deprived of a homeland. That people has been forced to live hand-to-mouth or to endure the daily yoke of military occupation in the Israeli-occupied Palestinian lands. The reason for this is crystal clear: Israel continues to pursue an implacable, chauvinist policy of total disregard and non-recognition not only of the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs but also of the very existence of the Arab people of Palestine.

124. As a result of arbitrary expropriations and requisitions of Arab land on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza Strip, the Israeli occupiers have been able to set up about 200 settlements. Tel Aviv continues to hatch its plans of sharp increases in the number of Israeli settlements in coming years. With respect to the indigenous Arab population, the occupation authorities are pursuing a policy of naked terror and violence. Behind all this is a desire to drive out the Palestinians from their ancestral lands and to carry out the total annexation of Palestinian territories.

125. The expansionist policy of the Israeli leaders has frequently been strongly condemned by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The practical steps taken by Israel within the context of its policy of *fait accompli*—the annexation of east Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, the activities of settlers in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip—have repeatedly and unambiguously been described by the international community as illegal and null and void.

126. Israel, however, does not wish to recognize a single United Nations resolution on the Palestinian question. It stubbornly refuses to comply with such resolutions both with respect to withdrawal from the occupied Arab lands and with respect to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Tel Aviv completely denies the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, as well as its right to establish its own independent State.

127. Does Israel have any grounds for such a policy? There can be no such grounds, and there are none. As everyone knows, General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 provided for the creation in the former Mandated Territory of Palestine not only of a Jewish but also of an Arab State. Is it really possible to dismember, to cut up that decision and to recognize one part of it while denying another? By not recognizing the rights of the Palestinian people to set up its own State, the Israeli leadership is rejecting resolution 181 (II), and it is precisely that resolution which constitutes the legal basis for the existence of Israel itself.

128. It is a matter of public record that the Israeli leadership makes clever and constant use of the concept of security for its own State. It would seem that such an obsessive concern for its own security should prompt the Israeli authorities to seek a common language with their neighbours and prompt them to try to coexist and normalize relations with them, as well as to seek mutually acceptable peaceful solutions on a reasonable basis. But exactly the opposite is true: in the course of all these years, Israel has been promoting not a programme of peace, but a programme of expansion and annexation, and has been committing more and more acts of aggression against the Arabs.

129. It is very clear that Israel would never have dared to conduct itself so presumptuously and cynically had it not been for outside support and assistance. Therefore, responsibility for the many years of conscious obstructionism in finding a solution to the problem of Palestine, as well as the entire range of problems involved in a Middle East settlement, must be borne not only by Israel; it is also the

responsibility of the United States. It is precisely the systematic political, economic and military support for Israel provided by Washington that has made it possible for Tel Aviv for many years to trample underfoot and usurp the rights of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and to disregard the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on the Middle East.

130. American policy in the Middle East has a lopsided pro-Israel tilt, and on the Palestinian question it is aimed at preventing the Palestinian people from exercising its national rights. That is the essence of all the notorious American plans, beginning with Camp David and continuing with the "Reagan plan" of 1 September 1982,[7] which, it would seem, it now wants to take down from its dusty shelf and present in new wrappings.

131. However, the many years of experience and the development of events in the Middle East indisputably show that the Middle East conflict and its core, the Palestinian problem, cannot be solved by separate deals and behind-the-scenes manoeuvring and machinations. There are more and more champions of the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine in the world. Their political support, including support within the United Nations, serves as a guarantee for success in the struggle for a just solution of the Palestinian problem within the context of a comprehensive Middle East settlement.

132. Of course, it goes without saying that of decisive significance is the struggle of the Palestinian people itself, the political vanguard of which is the PLO. It is extremely important to strengthen the cohesiveness of the Palestinian ranks on an anti-imperialistic patriotic basis. It is extremely important to maintain close co-operation between the PLO and the Arab peoples and countries, taking a very firm principled position in countering the expansionist plans of the United States and Israel, and that would make it possible for the Palestine resistance movement to overcome the difficulties it has been experiencing and to thwart the designs of imperialism and zionism in the Middle East and of all those who are working against the realization of the national aspirations of the Palestinian people.

133. The Soviet Union consistently backs the struggle of the Palestinians for their inalienable rights. This is borne out in the proposals made by the Soviet Union on 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*], taking account of the incontrovertible fact that the Palestinian problem is the key element in the entire range of problems in a Middle East settlement.

134. Based on the desire to promote the establishment of peace in the Middle East, the Soviet Union—and we feel it is necessary to recall this—has stated that the following principles are necessary for a Middle East settlement.

135. First, there should be strict compliance with the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of foreign territory by aggression. Consequently, all territories occupied by Israel since 1967 should be returned to the Arabs. This means the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, as well as Lebanese lands. The settlements established by Israel in the Arab territories after 1967 should be eliminated. The borders between Israel and its Arab neighbours should be declared inviolable.

136. Secondly, there must be effective guarantees of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, whose sole and legitimate representative is the PLO, as well as of its right to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State on Palestinian territory, liberated from Israeli occupation. This means the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. As provided for in the decision adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,[6] and with the consent of the Palestinians themselves, these regions could be transferred by Israel, for a short, transitional period not exceeding several months, to United Nations control.

137. After the establishment of an independent Palestinian State, that State would of course, by virtue of the sovereign right belonging to every State, determine the nature of its relations with neighbouring countries, including the possibility of forming confederations.

138. Palestinian refugees should be given, in accordance with United Nations decisions, the opportunity of returning to their homes or receiving appropriate compensation for the property they left behind.

139. Thirdly, East Jerusalem, which was occupied by Israel in 1967 and which includes one of the major Muslim holy places, should be returned to the Arabs and should become an integral part of the Palestinian State. In all of Jerusalem there should be free access to the holy places for believers of the three religions.

140. Fourthly, there should be real guarantees of the right of all States in the region to a secure and independent existence and to development. It goes without saying that there should be full reciprocity; genuine security cannot be provided for some when the security of others is neglected.

141. Fifthly, the state of war must be ended and peace must be established between the Arab States and Israel. This means that all parties to the conflict, including Israel and the Palestinian State, should undertake to respect each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. They must settle peacefully, by negotiations, any disputes that may arise between them.

142. Sixthly, international guarantees for the settlement must be worked out and adopted. The role of guarantor might be played by, for example, permanent members of the Security Council or by the Security Council as a whole. The Soviet Union, for its part, would be prepared to participate in that process of guaranteeing the settlement.

143. I turn now to the ways of reaching a settlement on the basis of the principles I have just set forth. Experience shows very, very clearly that the only correct and effective course in this regard is that of collective efforts, with the participation of all sides concerned. This means negotiations within the context of an international conference on the Middle East, specially convened for this purpose.

144. All Arab States having common borders with Israel, as well as Israel itself, should have the right to participate in the work of such a conference. The PLO, too, should be a full-fledged participant in the conference. The Soviet Union and the United States should also participate in the conference as States which, because of circumstances, play an important role in Middle East matters and which were the co-chairmen of the 1973 conference on the Middle East.

145. The course of the discussions on the entire set of Middle East problems shows that this point of

view is shared by an overwhelming majority of delegations. There is every reason to state that there is broad international agreement on the need to hold an international conference on the Middle East. This is also confirmed by the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held in 1983.[2] It is particularly significant that the General Assembly itself, in resolution 38/58 C, very clearly pronounced itself in favour of such a conference.

146. The Soviet Union is in favour of a truly just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. If such a settlement were worked out, there would be no need for even Israel to worry about its security. Merely by returning what does not belong to it, by returning what it has usurped, it could gain security and peace.

147. A just solution of the Palestine question, within the context of a comprehensive Middle East settlement, would be a significant contribution to the cause of stability and solid peace in the region. Furthermore, it would lead to an improvement in the international climate as a whole.

148. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the ten member States of the European Community.

149. The Ten remain deeply conscious of the importance which the Palestinian problem has for the future peace and security of the Middle East. Each year that passes without a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict makes its achievement more difficult, since attitudes of hostility become more entrenched and further problems are added to the existing ones. The Ten consider that Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) set out fundamental principles for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Such a settlement must, further, take account of both the right to existence and security of all States in the Middle East, including Israel, and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination with all that this implies. These views of the Ten have been elaborated in the declaration published at Venice on 13 June 1980[8] and their subsequent statement on this issue. In their declaration on the Middle East adopted at Brussels on 27 March 1984 [*see A/39/161, annex*] the Ten called on all parties to draw the necessary consequences from these principles and to start the negotiations necessary for their implementation.

150. The Ten's commitment to the right of Israel to live in security and peace is fundamental and unwavering. In parallel, they further confirm that there can be no real peace or stability in the region unless the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are recognized. In particular, self-determination for the Palestinian people, with all that this implies, remains a key issue which must be taken into account in the context of a comprehensive, just and durable settlement of the conflict. Thus, the essence of such a settlement must be a full, just and lasting accommodation between the State of Israel and the Palestinian people, so that they can live together in peace and security. A climate of confidence and understanding is an important element in the search for a comprehensive peace settlement. The Ten believe that such a climate can only be achieved by the parties concerned taking positive steps towards this goal, by ending acts of violence and by showing willingness to compromise. In the Ten's view, furthermore, a process of negotiation must involve mutual recognition of the existence and the rights of the parties in the conflict.

151. The Ten have repeatedly stressed their conviction that Israel will only obtain the security and recognition to which it has a right by seeking a negotiated settlement and in particular by satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. The Ten wish to see the Palestinian people in a position to pursue their demands by political means, and they consider that the achievement of these should take account of the need to recognize and respect the existence and security of all. The Ten continue to believe that it is neither wise nor just for one party to seek to deny the other the rights that it claims for itself.

152. Resolution of the problems between Israel and its neighbours should be based on the principles, widely accepted in the international community, of non-recourse to the use of force and of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. In accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), Israel must put an end to the territorial occupation it has maintained since the conflict of 1967.

153. The Ten are convinced that negotiations are the key to the problem and that it is for the parties concerned to negotiate a lasting settlement. A negotiated settlement will require the continuing and independent expression of the will of the Palestinian people.

154. The Ten have noted the recent meeting of the Palestine National Council at Amman. They continue to believe that the PLO must be associated with peace negotiations.

155. The Ten express their concern that the hopes engendered in September 1982 by certain converging and promising peace initiatives have been largely dissipated. The European Council, at its meeting held at Dublin on 3 and 4 December 1984, emphasized that it is vitally important that renewed efforts be made towards negotiations for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Ten note with satisfaction expressions of interest by both sides in a process of movement towards negotiations, and they hope that this declared interest will be further built on. In order to find a lasting solution, no amount of effort by third parties can be a substitute for direct negotiations among the parties themselves—the Arab States, Israel and the Palestinian people—which must recognize mutually one another's existence and rights. They call on all parties fully to implement the provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). They renew their call for an end to the illegal policy of settlements in the occupied territories.

156. In the past, the Ten have consistently offered to assist in any way open to them in attempts to identify common ground between the parties. The Ten, both collectively and individually, have maintained contact with all parties. In continuation of this policy, the Ten, as stated by the European Council on 4 December 1984, consider that such contacts should be developed with a view to seeking ways of promoting movement towards negotiation and improvement of the situation in the region.

157. The Ten have repeatedly indicated the principles on which they base their position concerning the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, in

particular the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. The Ten reaffirm that the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1907[9] and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[10] are applicable to all these territories until such time as an end is put, within the framework of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement, to the territorial occupation which Israel has maintained since 1967. The Ten are deeply concerned that Israeli policies in the area have led to mounting tension and continued unrest. In particular, the Ten remain profoundly concerned by the Israeli policies on settlements. They again confirm their position that these settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, as well as any change in the status and demographic structure of these territories, are illegal under international law and constitute a serious obstacle to peace efforts. Continuation of these policies can only undermine the necessary basis of dialogue and trust, which is an essential prerequisite for any constructive negotiation aimed at achieving a comprehensive peace settlement. Moreover, the Ten reiterate that the Israeli policy concerning East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights is contrary to international law and, therefore, invalid in their eyes. The Ten reaffirm their serious concern at the distress of the Palestinian civilian population and hope that the relevant international organizations will be allowed to assist this population without hindrance.

158. The Ten take note of the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*A/39/35*]. The views of the Ten and such reservations as are maintained by them in regard to the Committee are well known. At the same time, the Ten have noted with appreciation the reference to their efforts which appears in the Committee's report.

159. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm the Ten's support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Recognition of these rights remains one of the fundamental principles which, in the Ten's view, must guide the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East.

160. Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The optimism, albeit cautious, that marked our discussion last year on the question of Palestine, which has been on the agenda of the United Nations since its founding, seems now to have disappeared as the General Assembly deals with this serious and distressing problem again. It was with a certain amount of relief that the international community noted the adoption by the General Assembly last year of resolution 38/58 C, relating to the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, at which the Palestinian problem, which is at the very heart of all the Middle East conflicts, would find an equitable and lasting solution. The principles that should guide that conference are contained, as we know, in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights, adopted by consensus at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983.[2] Among those cardinal principles is, of course, recognition and the effective exercise of the legitimate, inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to return to their homes and to recover their property; the right to self-determination and to create their own independent, sovereign State in their fatherland, Palestine; and the right of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to take part on an equal footing with the other parties in all the efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East; as well as the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and recognition of the right of all States in the region to live in security within secure and internationally recognized borders.

161. It is clear that General Assembly resolution 38/58 C is the mainspring of a machinery which sets out realistic ways and means for building just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East, in which all the parties directly concerned, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, are justly served. It is encouraging to note that since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, world public opinion has become more acutely aware of the specific features and the gravity of the question of Palestine and of the urgent need for the world community to arrive at a just and lasting solution. This is demonstrated by the fact that this very year, under the auspices of the United Nations, specifically of its Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, of which my country has had the honour to be a member, a number of seminars and round tables were organized in various parts of the world. Eminent jurists, parliamentarians and representatives of non-governmental organizations participated in these meetings. The participants were unanimous in their recognition that the question of Palestine is a fundamental element for any settlement of the Middle East conflict, and they concluded that it is necessary to convene, as soon as possible, an international peace conference on the Middle East in accordance with the spirit and the letter of resolution 38/58 C. Those are the legitimate hopes of all segments of the international community which cherish peace, justice, freedom and progress.

162. The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic is following with special attention the consultations being carried out by the Secretary-General, under the mandate entrusted to him by the relevant resolution, with members of the Security Council and the representatives of Governments of countries directly concerned in the Arab-Israeli conflict, aimed at learning their views and suggestions regarding the organization and convening of such a conference.

163. Reading the Secretary-General's report [*A/39/130 and Add.1*], we were genuinely disappointed to learn that the United States Government, unlike the Soviet Government—whose peace plan is, in essence, very close to the guiding principles adopted at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine—is persisting in its arrogant and negative attitude towards this fundamental problem. It should also be stressed that the Final Communiqué adopted at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984 [*see A/39/560*], also condemned the negative stand taken by Israel and the United States. We should not be excessively surprised at this obstructionist move by the United States Administration, for it is in keeping with its global strategy of expansion and domination over that region and over the entire world. Everyone knows that it is because of the unconditional and

varied support—political, military and economic—provided by United States imperialism and by a number of its other allies that the illegal racist Pretoria régime has been able with impunity to pursue its criminal policy of *apartheid* against the black majority population of South Africa and its illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

164. With regard to the Middle East—a region where, as we know, the conflicts have their deep-seated origins in the shocking injustices committed for decades by the Zionist forces and their United States sponsors against the Palestinian people—my delegation considers that the Arab world must form a united front to fight the common enemy. It is in the aggressive and expansionist nature of zionism and imperialism never to countenance the enjoyment by the Middle East, or any other part of the world, of lasting peace and security. In order to carry out their sinister designs, these dominating, oppressive forces are working actively to sow division and hatred among the nations and peoples of the Middle East, nations and peoples which, however, share a rich common historic, cultural and religious heritage. It is no secret that United States imperialism will do everything in its power to help Israeli zionism, its "strategic ally", achieve its demonic dream of building a Greater Israel, which, obviously, would embrace not only the Palestinian and Arab territories already occupied since 1967, but also those of other States of the region.

165. How many resolutions have been adopted on the burning and painful question of Palestine and the Middle East since the founding of the United Nations? We only know that they are beyond counting and that the Zionist State, with the blessing of its imperialist protectors, has chosen to defy them and has done so with total impunity. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People informs us in its detailed periodic reports about the brutality and inhumanity of the aggressive and repressive measures which the Zionist forces of occupation have taken and continue to take every day against the defenceless Palestinian and Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories. We are also informed about the extremely heroic way in which the Palestinian people, under the vigorous leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative, has mounted armed resistance against the occupation forces in a struggle which has always enjoyed the sympathy and solidarity of the entire international community. Moreover, there is every reason to believe that the Zionist forces are still frenetically pursuing their diabolical plan to establish and develop settlements in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, including Jerusalem, in defiance of fundamental principles of international law declaring all acquisition of territory by force to be null and void. The invasion of Lebanon by the Zionist forces in June 1982, followed in September of that year by their massacre of Palestinian civilians in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps, showed the world how barbarous and formidable zionism is.

166. Are we to conclude from all this that the international community, and the United Nations, whose primary responsibility with regard to the question of Palestine has been recognized, remain powerless to find a just and lasting solution to this distressing problem? We do not think so, for an adequate framework or machinery for a settlement has already been found, as is shown by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. An international consensus has already emerged on this question. As we all know, the stumbling-block is the negative attitude of the United States and its "strategic ally", Israel. The international community and the United Nations must redouble their efforts to overcome that stumbling-block by all the means available to them, so that the international peace conference on the Middle East may be organized and convened under United Nations auspices as soon as possible. At stake is peace, stability and harmonious co-operation in the region, which, of course, cannot be separated from world peace and security. At stake, above all, is the triumph of the sacred cause of the heroic people of Palestine, a cause to which the Lao Government and people have always lent their unswerving support.

167. Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka follows a number of speakers in this debate on the question of Palestine and many more speakers have put down their names to participate in the debate. I shall therefore be brief. Each year this debate takes place, and the question of Palestine is no nearer settlement than it was when the General Assembly discussed it the previous year. The region of the Middle East continues to be a region of "festering conflict and wrongs unrighted", as the Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Gauci, described it this morning [*88th meeting*]. This should not instil in us a sense of cynicism or apathy. The continuing lack of a settlement should sharpen rather than discourage our will to seek a solution.

168. In reviewing developments in the past year, we see that the fate of the Palestinian people has undergone tragic vicissitudes. Last week, the General Assembly discussed the related item of the situation in the Middle East, and developments in the region as a whole were reviewed. Virtually every speaker concurred in the view that the situation remains dangerously explosive and complicated, not only acting as a deterrent to the peaceful development and security of the States in the Middle East region, but also, in a broader sense, threatening international peace and security. While we recognize that, as in any other region, there are certain unresolved issues in the Middle East, these are extraneous to the central issue of Palestine with which we are now dealing.

169. Whatever the disputes that affect the region, the basic features of the situation in Palestine have remained unchanged. In other words, the root causes of the tension, insecurity, suffering and death in the region, as well as the key to a possible way out of the impasse, can be clearly identified and addressed.

170. We repeat ourselves when we say that the question of Palestine is the crux of the unrest in the Middle East. This is a repetition that is necessary and one which is, in fact, pivotal to our discussion. There are other sources of tension in the Middle East, but the central issue, without the solution of which no peace is possible, is the question of Palestine. At the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, the heads of State reaffirmed that the Israeli occupation of Palestine and the usurpation and denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

171. The solution of the Palestine question hinges on two basic conditions: the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force; and the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. These rights include the right to return to their homeland, the right to self-determination without external interference, and the right to a sovereign national State in Palestine.

172. While continued strife in the Middle East exacts a terrible toll of all Arab peoples, it is the Palestinians who have suffered most. As a people, as a nation, they have been tragically dispersed virtually throughout the world, with many of them in refugee camps. Attempts have been made to dismiss the Palestinians as some sort of permanent refugee population and to deny their specific identity as a people and a nation.

173. The experiences of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories are known to members of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. The report of the Special Committee [*A/39/591*] speaks for itself. The Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has given an exhaustive account of the plight of the Palestinian people. We thank Mr. Sarré, of Senegal, and members of the Committee for their devotion and for the comprehensive report [*A/39/35*].

174. The establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories is illegal and a serious obstacle to a just and comprehensive solution of the question of Palestine. All steps taken in these territories to effect changes in their political, cultural, religious, demographic, physical and geographic character are null and void and illegal. The Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949[11]—in particular, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War—and Additional Protocols 1 and 2,[12] adopted in 1977, should be applied to the occupied territories.

175. Despite their untold suffering, the Palestinian people have continued their struggle. The PLO has succeeded against massive odds in uniting and channelling this struggle. The PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and, without doubt, the organization which should represent the Palestinian people in any negotiations affecting their future. The PLO should participate as a full and equal party in any conference or settlement process. Sri Lanka has accorded full diplomatic recognition to the PLO, whose mission in Colombo enjoys full embassy status.

176. What is most ironic is that, although the essential elements necessary for a settlement of the Palestine question have now been recognized and are part of a near-universal consensus, positive steps to give effect to them have not been taken. The Arab States themselves, including the Palestinians, at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*], the Commonwealth, the Inter-Parliamentary Union and other organizations, have reaffirmed those features, which are the *sine qua non* of any just and lasting settlement. It is for the international community now to redouble its efforts, through the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, to bring about negotiations for a settlement and to usher in conditions of peace and tranquillity to a region which has for far too long known neither.

177. Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Palestinian people continues to struggle for its very existence as a nation, for its right to self-determination and for the right to set up its own independent State on its national soil. This struggle is an integral part of the struggle of the peoples of the world against colonialism, foreign domination and aggression.

178. The Palestinian people is the victim of the greatest imperialist and Zionist conspiracy which the twentieth century has witnessed.

179. At a time when colonialism in its earlier forms has begun to disappear under the continuous assault of the peoples, when the socialist revolution has become stronger in various parts of the world and when democratic public opinion in Europe and America has made itself felt and is exerting pressure against colonialism and in favour of the right of peoples to self-determination, the neo-colonialists are seeking to preserve their selfish interests.

180. In the Middle East, in particular, neo-colonialism has come to an agreement with world zionism, which sought a country to colonize and where Zionist capital could be freely managed.

181. Great Britain, which needed Zionist assistance, was convinced of the importance of this project. After visiting various third-world regions, it chose Palestine for the implementation of the Zionist plot. The reason Palestine was chosen was explained by the President of the World Jewish Congress, Mr. Nahum Goldmann, in 1947, at Montreal:

> "The Jews could have chosen Uganda, Madagascar or other countries to establish their national homeland, but they wanted Palestine, not because the Dead Sea, if it was drained, could supply minerals and salt of an estimated value of $5 billion, not because the subsoil of Palestine, it was said, contained oil reserves greater than those of the entire American continent, but because Palestine is a crossroads of routes linking Europe, Asia and America, the real centre of force and of world political power, that is, the strategic and military centre for domination of the world."

182. Zionism undertook a vast campaign to convince Jews throughout the world of the usefulness of this plan and, to justify its designs, it invented historical myths, conjuring up a kingdom stretching from the Nile to the Euphrates; and it called Palestine the promised land. Zionism aroused the feelings of some Jews and mobilized them on false premises.

183. That is how the plot was carried out. Despite national, cultural and linguistic differences, Jews were uprooted from their countries of origin and used as a weapon is used to commit a crime. Thus the Haganah was called upon to spill the blood of the Palestinian people at Deir Yassin and elsewhere, an unprecedented event in the history of mankind.

184. Zionism continued its manoeuvres and pressure to make world public opinion accept the *fait accompli* of the creation of Israel. These events took place in 1947, and everyone knows about them.

185. Since its creation, Israel has used violence against the Palestinians and aggression against the

neighbouring countries. All the reports submitted to this session of the General Assembly prove this.

186. Israel applies collective sanctions by imprisoning whole families, demolishing houses, ejecting people and depriving them of the right to work, imposing excessive taxes and refusing to grant the most basic social rights. Israel practises corporal punishment and physical and moral torture against detainees and deprives the sick of medical care by closing down hospitals and health-care centres. This arbitrary policy has resulted in increasing the mortality rate and the number of mentally sick.

187. Israel has seized Palestinian land and has driven out the inhabitants in order to establish Zionist settlements. In addition, it prevents the Arab population from having access to drinking water and water for irrigation. That is why Israel has laid its hands on the waters of the Jordan and of the Golan Heights and the West Bank and is trying to change the course of the Litani River in Lebanon.

188. However, this is not enough. It is trying to quench the spirit of an entire people by dispossessing it of its archaeological and cultural heritage in the occupied territories, changing education programmes, banning national newspapers, imposing restrictions on artists and writers and preventing the entry into the occupied areas of any worthwhile work of art.

189. This has but one purpose: to cause the economic, cultural and social collapse of the Palestinian community and to drive the Palestinians into exile so that Israel can implement its plans.

190. This racist policy is quite in keeping with what Herzl wrote in 1902: "We must campaign against foreigners. We must have only Jews in this place of Jewish settlement."

191. In 1967, Golda Meir reaffirmed this when she said: "The Jews have occupied the West Bank to settle there for good. There must be as few Arabs as possible in the area."

192. Any State or entity that carries out acts of aggression and resorts to illegal and inhuman practices such as these, must not benefit from any right within the framework of the international community. On the contrary, the international community, individually and collectively, must punish such a State or entity. In 1967, General de Gaulle adopted a courageous position because he had become convinced of the aggressive intentions of Israel: he prohibited the export of weapons to Israel. That position should serve as an example to all countries that cherish peace and stability in the world.

193. The question of Palestine is not, as Israel claims, a question which concerns the Arabs and the Jews alone. It is the cause of a people struggling against colonialism, against which the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have struggled and are still struggling to regain their dignity and exercise sovereignty in their own lands.

194. As the late President Nasser said in July 1964 at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Cairo:

> "What is happening to the people of Palestine is similar to what the African peoples have undergone. Foreign settlers have come into their country, invoking racist supremacy. They have stolen the land, and driven out its owners, and they have been helped by the colonialists, whose agents of various kinds they have become."

195. It is the duty of all free men throughout the world to stand at the side of the Palestinian people, the Namibian people and the people of South Africa in their struggle against Zionist and racist colonialism.

196. The General Assembly and many other United Nations organs have adopted resolutions on the question of Palestine. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the OAU have done the same. But Israel has rejected or defied all those resolutions.

197. The intransigence of Israel, its insults addressed to representatives of the United Nations, and sometimes its assassinations—as in the case of the international Mediator, Count Bernadotte—have had adverse effects on the credibility and the influence of the United Nations and the effectiveness of its resolutions.

198. Mauritania, like all States that cherish peace and justice, places great hopes in the United Nations as an instrument for the application of the principles of the Charter, which are based on respect for human rights, justice, equality and the law. Mauritania believes that in order to recover its effectiveness the Organization must apply strict sanctions against Israel to compel it to respect human rights; otherwise, Israel will just continue to practise terrorism, aggression and expansionism.

199. My country once again associates itself with those that condemn Israeli aggression and believe that it must withdraw unconditionally from all of Palestine, including Jerusalem, and all the Arab territories. Similarly, my country condemns the Israeli settlement policy, which it considers to be contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to all international rules and standards. We condemn the acts of oppression and brutality perpetrated by Israel against the people of the occupied territories. We strongly condemn Israel for carrying out the massacres in Sabra and Shatila.

200. Mauritania believes that the question of Palestine is the core of the conflict in the Middle East and that the PLO is the principal party in the struggle against Israeli aggression. Therefore, negotiations aimed at finding a peaceful solution to the problems of the region must not take place without the participation and the agreement of the PLO.

201. Today, the course of history is moving in the direction of the triumph of the Palestinians and against the usurpers, because it is for a just cause that the Palestinian people have resorted to revolution. However long the night may last, day must finally dawn, and every time Israeli terrorism is stepped up the struggle becomes greater and the day of liberation in Palestine comes closer. The Mauritanian poet Ahmed Weld Abd El-Khader was right when he said, after the outbreak of Palestinian armed revolution: "Miracles are accomplished by the masses, and injustice gives birth to freedom. From arbitrary acts and oppression in Palestine is born the revolution that is worth any sacrifice."

202. The most violent aggression of our time has been committed against the Palestinian people, the people made up of a whole generation of fedayeen, who have no fear of death and who rely on their indomitable will and the strength of all peoples that cherish peace and justice and the entire international

community, which has recognized their inalienable, historical rights, including the right of return, to self-determination and to establish their own independent State on their national soil, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative.

203. Mr. OYOUÉ (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is once again discussing the question of Palestine. Thus, despite the passage of time and the great changes in our world since the Second World War, some very important questions have not, regrettably, developed so satisfactorily.

204. One of those questions, the Palestine problem—another unfortunate legacy of the League of Nations—remains one of the tragedies of our century; it cannot be discussed without indignation.

205. This indignation that we feel when we take up the present agenda item demonstrates the extent of our solidarity with the Palestinian people, which for almost half a century has been deprived of its legitimate rights. Never in the history of modern societies has a people been confronted with such a serious situation, whose scope increases day by day.

206. Next year the United Nations will commemorate its fortieth anniversary. My delegation believes that the international community must use that occasion to reflect on the sad fate that history has meted out to the Palestinian people, who continue to endure the monstrous effects of the Balfour Declaration.

207. It is now more than 10 years since, in 1973, the Government of Gabon, concerned at the tragic fate of the fraternal Palestinian people, solemnly demonstrated its devotion to the ideals of justice and peace by breaking off diplomatic relations with Israel.

208. Today, 6 December 1984, when the United Nations is discussing this question, as it has done for very many years now, my delegation wishes to express once again the solidarity of the people of Gabon with the Palestinian people, which is waging a struggle the justness of which need not be proved.

209. In my delegation's opinion, the present debate should be, for all of us, a time of deep reflection and of awareness of what has come to be called the "Palestinian tragedy". This should be so despite the diversity of our origins and the differences in our political preferences and views.

210. None of us can be insensitive or indifferent to the genesis of the Palestinian people. The importance of the events certainly warrants a brief glance at the past in order better to understand that since 1947, faced with the Hebrew State's intransigence and stubborn refusal to accept the United Nations partition plan, the Palestinian people has been wandering throughout the world, seeking a land and a country.

211. The establishment of the Palestinian resistance in 1956, leading in 1964 to the birth of the PLO, unfortunately did not result in any concrete solution to the problem. On the contrary, it was followed by the settlement of Arab territories by Israel, after the so-called six-day war in June 1967.

212. Israel committed one misdeed after another; its malevolent and cynical behaviour reached its highest point in 1982 with the massacres at Sabra and Shatila, during which thousands of Palestinians met atrocious deaths. Another event, no less criminal, was the mass poisoning of Palestinian students in the occupied territories.

213. We cannot but be convinced that this squalid attitude on the part of the Hebrew State is a reflection of its notorious refusal to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to be different, its right to independence and self-determination. Israel takes this attitude despite the many resolutions, recommendations and decisions of the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference in favour of a negotiated solution to this problem.

214. Gabon, which supports the positions taken by the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, believes that this refusal by Israel to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people is a serious obstacle to détente in the region.

215. In our country's opinion, there cannot be any doubt that the climate of tension in the Middle East is the result of Israel's intransigence in pursuing an aggressive and annexationist policy against the Palestinian people, which has been deprived of its inalienable right to exist on its national territory. Israel's constant use of force makes more difficult the establishment of a real process of peaceful settlement of the Palestinian problem, which so seriously affects international peace and security.

216. Hence, it is not surprising that all the peace initiatives that have been undertaken recently have encountered difficulties. It also is not surprising that the relevant resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly have not been implemented.

217. From that standpoint, we can only, most unfortunately, accept the fact that the Palestine problem has a very wide scope and also, and above all, that the situation in that part of the world is unstable. In this connection, I recall the words spoken on 10 October from this rostrum by Mr. Martin Bongo, Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Gabonese Republic, in reference to the situation prevailing in the Middle East:

> "In the Middle East . . . the Gabonese Government is convinced that a settlement that would not take into account the deeply felt aspirations of the Palestinian people cannot be a lasting one. In this connection, we reaffirm the right of the Palestinian people to a peaceful existence and to remain permanently within secure and recognized boundaries, like all other peoples in the region. Once again, we call upon the Government of Israel to put an end to its settlements policy in the occupied territories, a policy that is endangering the chances of an overall settlement of the conflict." [*29th meeting, para. 132.*]

218. Thus, for my delegation, Palestine is at the heart of the thorny problem of the insecurity in the Middle East and, at the same time, it is the nub of the Israeli-Arab conflict.

219. Therefore, just and lasting peace, and, what is more, an equitable solution to this conflict, will not be possible in Palestine and the Middle East unless Israel renounces recourse to force, which, unfortunately, it has always used as a means of deterrence or to settle its disputes with the Arab world.

220. As far as Gabon is concerned, the international community must be further convinced of the need for a clearer reaffirmation of the inalienable rights of

the Palestinian people, led by the PLO, its only legitimate representative.

221. On the basis of its support for the United Nations resolutions, my country joins the international community in stating that the time has come for us to realize that peace in the region can be based only upon the complete withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, and the restoration of the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to establish a State of its own.

222. My delegation believes that such a process is the only one that could lead to peace. Hence, Israel must end its policy of establishing settlements, the consequences of which are serious even for the neighbouring countries of the region, which are faced with the situation of not being able to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

223. I cannot end this statement without paying a warm tribute to the Secretary-General, who has made unceasing efforts in support of the just cause of the Palestinian people. Here I should like to emphasize that some of his initiatives in this context are capable of bringing about a peaceful settlement of this dispute. Lastly, I wish to commend the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian people for the quality of its report [*A/39/35*].

224. My delegation has faith in the future and maintains the hope that all the steps taken within the United Nations and in various other international bodies will soon bring the international community to the point at which it can compel Israel to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, which, like all other peoples in our civilized world, aspires to dignity, self-determination and independence.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, appendix III.

[2] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[3] See A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 83.

[4] *Ibid.*, para. 98.

[5] *Ibid.*, appendix II.

[6] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[7] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[8] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14009.

[9] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915), p. 100.

[10] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[11] *Ibid.*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.

[12] *Ibid.*, vol. 1125, Nos. 17512 and 17513.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

90th PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 7 December 1984, at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. MOUNKEILA (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): Hardly had the General Assembly finished its consideration of the contemptible system of *apartheid*, which is desperately striving to perpetuate its illegal domination of Namibia and its theory of separate development in South Africa, than it turned to another challenge: that of zionism in all its arrogance and in all its unjust, unacceptable and intolerable manifestations.

2. Like Pretoria, Tel Aviv has been defying the international community for nearly 40 years. More than 200 resolutions have been devoted to this question, resolutions which are the product of many years of reflection, effort, dedicated and painstaking work and perseverance, but which have led to frustration and shattered hopes. That is the impression we got from the Secretary-General's statement before the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, in which he said that the question of Palestine was among the problems which had been before the United Nations virtually since the creation of the world Organization and that we had not yet been able to resolve it.

3. This impression of powerlessness is given also by the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/130 and Add. 1*], in which he informs the General Assembly about his efforts within the framework of resolution 38/58 C regarding the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, aimed at achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, one essential element of which would be the creation in Palestine of an independent Palestinian State.

4. I would reassure those who have that impression: the powerlessness of the United Nations to settle the question of Palestine—and those of *apartheid* and Namibia—is felt by the Government and the people of Niger to be an insult to the Palestinian people, an affront to the Arab people and a challenge to the peoples of the entire world.

5. There is no need to lose hope. The road may be a long one, but it inevitably leads to the final goal: the creation in Palestine of an independent and sovereign Palestinian State. Just as Namibia's victory over South Africa is inevitable, it is true too, as stated by the Head of State of Niger, President Seyni Kountché, that: "The march of history is such that situations which are characterized only by a lack of progress always yield ultimately to the might of justice, the force of the rule of law, or the sword of freedom."

6. Let us hope and persevere. In a Sahelian country like Niger, those two words are full of meaning. Confronted every day with the hostile environment of the Sahel, where we manage to wrest our meagre daily bread, we have learned from history and nature to hope and to persevere, carefully to watch the horizon and beyond in the hope of glimpsing a small cloud bearing the rain of salvation. But although our eyes are riveted on the horizon, we do not ignore—quite the contrary—the scant ground water and underground sources we find at our feet.

7. Similarly, with regard to the question before us today, we shall persevere and continue to focus our gaze and our hopes on the international community, principally on certain States Members which have the power—but, even more, the international responsibility, as defined in the Charter of the United Nations—to put pressure on Israel to comply with the law and with international morality so that the Palestinian people may find justice. But just as with the waters and rains of the Great Sahel, our trust and hope in the international community must in no wise prevent us from looking around us and seeing that the Palestine Liberation Organization *[PLO]* exists as the sole representative of the heroic, struggling Palestinian people and that it should enjoy our full support. In this connection, my country's unequivocal position was stated before the General Assembly on 3 October 1984 by Mr. Idé Oumaru, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation:

> "At this stage, I would assure the martyred Palestinian people and battered Lebanon, as well as all the brother Arab countries of the battlefield, of the unswerving and active support of the Government and people of Niger. Niger, as is well known, spares no effort to ensure the triumph of justice and right in that part of the world." [*19th meeting, para. 206.*]

8. It is the responsibility primarily of the United Nations to resolve the present situation in that part of the world, as has been true since 1947 when it took on the mantle of the League of Nations in this regard. Member States have the duty in law to assist in this task by supporting the adoption and implementation of relevant resolutions on the question on the basis of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition

of territory by force. Israel should unconditionally withdraw from Palestine and the Arab territories occupied since 1967, in conformity with Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

9. In the meantime, as the *de facto* administering Power in those territories, Israel should comply with international law, particularly by refraining from modifying the ethnic and demographic character of the local population or its culture and civilization. Above all, Israel should comply with the various Geneva conventions on humanitarian law, particularly the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[1] The multi-ethnic and multi-religious status of the Holy City of Jerusalem must be preserved, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 35/169 E.

10. In the sphere of humanitarian issues and human rights, we cannot understand how the Israeli Government, which claims to represent one of history's most long-suffering peoples, can behave in a manner as intolerable as that of those who, about 40 years ago, were vowing that people's extermination. The disastrous living conditions of the populations of Palestine and the other occupied territories bear eloquent witness to this. Thus it was that the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories pertinently concluded its 1984 report by saying that:

> "the situation in the occupied territories suffers from continuing deterioration in the level of respect for the human rights of the civilian population . . . and affects all sectors . . . from the civil and political, to the economic, social and cultural sectors. On the other hand, the hundreds of thousands who are outside the occupied territories are still denied the right to return while their property is being taken over for the establishment of Israeli settlements." [*See A/39/591, para. 338.*]

11. A new element that is a source of major concern for my country is the appearance in Israel of a form of violence carefully structured into a kind of movement. The French weekly, *Le Nouvel Observateur*, of 16 November 1984, under the title "I fear for Israel" and with the subtitle, "How, by exalting anti-Arab terrorism, a madman exposes his country to the worst kind of threat", reports the comments of the Israeli writer Amos Kenan, author of *The Road to Ein Harod*, on the racist methods of the Kach movement, which means "thus", whose emblem is a closed fist against a yellow background, which signifies "this is what must be done with the Arabs". This rational structure of repression, directed by a certain member of the Knesset, has nothing to learn from certain notorious organizations of the past.

12. This is an abomination, an insult to the international conscience which demands action before it is too late.

13. Aware of this shameful, scandalous situation in the settlements, we call upon the Western countries and friends of Israel, which are often our friends and partners, to realize the danger and to take the necessary steps. We know that they have the means to do so; that with their respect for the human person and dedication to democracy they have the moral duty to do so; and that some of them, as permanent members of the Security Council, have a legal responsibility for international peace and security. Action should be all the easier today in that, according to certain information provided by the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories,

> "within Israel itself, movements have arisen and gained ground against this situation. The Special Committee has noted in particular information reflecting the increase of such protests by organizations such as that known as 'Peace Now'." [*Ibid.*]

14. We therefore feel that it is high time for a comprehensive, just and lasting political settlement of the question of Palestine. All our efforts must be aimed in that direction. This settlement should of course be based on the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, which recognize, among other things: the inadmissibility of the occupation of territories by force and thus the need for unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem; recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent, sovereign State in its homeland, Palestine, under the leadership of the PLO; and the full participation of the PLO in any peace process. As President Seyni Kountché stated:

> "We emphasize that any approach that would prevent the Palestine Liberation Organization from playing its part would run the risk of being neither just nor rational and would thus constitute only a provisional solution, that is to say, of being in no way final."

15. We call upon all States parties to this question to show a spirit of understanding and the political will necessary for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, as recommended in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C and in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983.[2] The two principal great Powers, in view of their interests in the region and above all in view of their responsibility as permanent members of the Security Council, the main and only organ charged with the maintenance of international peace and security, have an important role to play in the preparation, conduct and success of that conference. They must shoulder their historic responsibility in fact and in law as the principal architects of the famous resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949, which decided "that Israel is a peace-loving State which accepts the obligations contained in the Charter and is able and willing to carry out those obligations."

16. Thus, we appeal to the international community to deal with the consequences of this ingratitude and this challenge so that justice may be done to the Palestinian people. All the States Members of the United Nations should help in this noble task of the eradication of the greatest act of injustice of this century.

17. It would be ungrateful of us not to commend all the governmental and non-governmental organizations that have worked in one way or another to contribute to the search for peace and justice.

18. We thank especially the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to achieve a consensus on the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East.

19. Our gratitude and congratulations go also to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and especially to its Chairman, our friend and brother Massamba Sarré, whose dedication to the Palestinian cause is measured by his faith in justice and peace.

20. Niger, for its part, is ready today, as it has always been since its accession to sovereignty, to make its own honourable though modest contribution to the solution of this problem. As an African Muslim country, its traditions and its faith require it always to respond whenever and wherever justice, dignity and the flowering of the human spirit are at stake.

21. Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On 29 November 1984 we commemorated, as is our custom, the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, in accordance with the objectives determined by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. The Palestinian people are struggling to regain their legitimate rights and to establish their independent State on their national territory.

22. In the General Assembly, the international parliament which represents the overwhelming majority of the world community, we have been discussing this humanitarian question for more than three decades. Many resolutions have been adopted in order to try to end the explosive situation in the Middle East region and win recognition of the right of the Palestinian People to self-determination and realization of its legitimate interests. On a number of occasions the General Assembly has emphasized the need for a comprehensive settlement of the question of Palestine. The General Assembly and the Security Council, in many resolutions—in particular Security Council resolution 242 (1967)—have clearly stated the need for Israel to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied since 1967. We should be mindful of the historic responsibility which is legally incumbent upon the United Nations for a solution to be found to this extremely complicated question. On 29 November 1947, the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II), concerning the partition of Palestine and the creation of two States in Palestine: a Jewish State and a Palestinian State. Today, despite the complexity of the situation and the fact that it is deteriorating, and despite the deadlock in which we now find ourselves, the annexation by Israel of Palestinian territory for its political, strategic and military reasons, under the pretext of maintaining Israel's security, remains inadmissible.

23. Israel's occupation of Lebanon under the pretext of maintaining the security of its northern borders revealed that this pretext was false and empty. The situation in Lebanon has become more complicated. Israel was obliged to withdraw from Lebanese towns and to regroup in the south after having suffered very severe blows from the heroic Lebanese resistance. Thus the theory of Israeli security has fallen flat. We hope that the occupation of southern Lebanon will not last for long and that the Lebanese will themselves reach agreement on how to effect their national reconciliation and resolve their problems.

24. Israel is today carrying out a policy of establishing settlements. The Arab peoples, including the Palestinians, who have struggled for many decades for their national liberation from all dependency and from any form of colonialism, will never bow to this new aggressive policy of expansionism. They will confront it with determination, as they confronted colonialism in its most heinous form in the past.

25. Israel has adopted a policy of arbitrary oppression in an attempt to deprive the Palestinian people of its identity. It carries out a policy of repression and mass extermination and has not hesitated, when deemed necessary, to have recourse to shedding blood and introducing terrorism and violence in the Middle East.

26. The Palestinian people, which has suffered for a long time, will always have a powerful and strong will, for it is a people that believes in the justice of its cause and is prepared to make any sacrifice to recover its freedom and its national independence. We believe that Israel will never succeed in undermining the identity and the personality of the Palestinians, just as it will not crush their hopes, which are embodied in the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Zionist plots and propaganda will all come to naught.

27. A just settlement of the question of Palestine is at the very basis of any solution of the Middle East problem. The cause of the conflict in that important region of the world—which is under constant tension—resides in the failure to recognize the rights of the Palestinian people, whose aspiration is to return to their usurped country and to enjoy their full rights.

28. The entire world has recognized the rights of the Palestinian people, a heroic and courageous people, a people which has won international solidarity. But these aspirations have to be transformed into specific actions which will help the Palestinians to exercise their right to self-determination and the creation of their own independent State, and to recover their inalienable rights. It is extremely regrettable that numerous resolutions, decisions and recommendations of the United Nations on this question have so far failed to allow them to recover their homeland or to exercise their inalienable rights. It is not enough to make recommendations and adopt resolutions without international implementation and commitment.

29. World public opinion has supported the implementation of the rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people, but it appears that it no longer wishes simply to listen to eloquent and lengthy statements made in international forums.

30. There is now a growing international awareness of the claims put forward by the Palestinian people and of the necessity of achieving a comprehensive and just solution taking into account the aspirations of the Palestinian people. The question of Palestine has now been considered in the United Nations for more than three decades and the international community must now succeed in creating the State promised to the Palestinians. It is not enough that we stand behind the Palestinians and understand their problems. We must find a political solution to this question, because it is an issue which concerns an entire people and a nation and is not simply a matter of refugees. It is therefore up to the major Powers concerned to listen to the Palestinians and recognize their rights to self-determination and the creation of a Palestinian State, and to save this region, which is experiencing constant tension, from the scourge of war. Otherwise, the security and safety of the region will be further endangered, and the entire situation could explode.

31. It is hardly necessary here to repeat what Israel's policies are—to annex occupied Arab territories and to continue their policy of colonization after the exodus of the population and after confiscating their lands, as in 1981 when the Golan Heights and East Jerusalem were annexed. The important thing is to ascertain how we can put an end to Israeli occupation and to this escalation of a policy of aggression against the unarmed Palestinian people.

32. This session of the General Assembly, like previous sessions, will undoubtedly adopt resolutions in favour of the Palestinian people. And Israel, as it has done in the past, will reject all these resolutions and all the appeals made by the international community asking it to withdraw from occupied Arab territories. International law prohibits the acquisition of territory by force, but, through force and *faits accomplis,* Israel has spurned all international decisions. For that reason, it is up to all States that support Israel economically and militarily to put an end to that support and to exert pressure on Israel to abide by international resolutions, those of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Only then would the Middle East become a region enjoying both peace and security.

33. The readiness of the Arabs and the Palestinians to accept a peace based on right and legitimacy has clearly been shown in the Final Declaration adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference.[3] It expressed the desire of the Arabs, including the Palestinians, to reach a peaceful and just solution in the Middle East. All hopes are now placed in the possibility of an international peace conference being held, with the participation of all parties concerned, in order to find a solution to the Palestinian problem in accordance with the principles underlying the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983. It is up to the United Nations to assume its historic responsibilities and organize that conference, on which will hinge the future of peace in our region.

34. In conclusion, the Palestine National Council, which met recently at Amman, has reaffirmed that the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

35. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The question of Palestine, the question of questions of the century, is the problem of a people, the problem of a homeland, a problem of regional peace, a problem of international peace, a question of human rights and of homelands, a problem of frontiers and neighbours, a question of the deceit of an ally and the treachery of a friend, a problem of usurping the wealth of a people and of destroying the future of a nation, a problem of attacks on sacred places and of violation of places of worship. It is the quintessence of all the problems of the century. They brought it to the altar of the United Nations in order to slay it, but it was stronger than the knife they wanted to slay it with. But truth will overcome every falsehood.

36. I should like to express our appreciation and gratitude for the efforts of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. Its objectives and activities represent an enlightened dimension of the work of the Organization in its efforts to promote the implementation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations at a time when it is discovering the extent to which some countries that signed the Charter have violated its text and spirit. There is no choice for the United Nations and for the world but to secure the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. It is the only way to avoid further deterioration of the situation in the region and the world.

37. While we are today discussing the question of Palestine for the thirty-eighth year in succession, some might ask, if they are unaware of the facts: What is new about the problem of Palestine that it is continually discussed at the United Nations? The question in itself has the implicit and adequate answer for the inquirer.

38. The story begins in the General Assembly in 1947, when Great Britain, the State that after the First World War was entrusted by the League of Nations to administer Palestine and guarantee the rights of the Palestinian people, referred the problem to the United Nations. Great Britain had by then, within a period of 30 years, allowed 600,000 Zionist immigrants into the country from various parts of the world. The United Nations, under tremendous political pressure well known to those who were then present, had allocated unjustly, and amazingly, a part of the country under its administration to those immigrants who had entered during the 30-year period under the protection of the foreign occupation Power, and who owned only 6 per cent of the registered land of Palestine. Imagine such an unjust verdict emanating from a body that was asked to restore the rights of the victims of injustice and aggression, but instead committed the crime of attempting to eliminate the legitimate party. What an oppressive judge, and what a bad verdict!

39. That was the beginning of the problem in the United Nations 38 years ago, when the Organization was deceived and all sorts of political pressures were used to secure a majority of votes to recommend the partition of the Arab country of Palestine and the establishment of a Zionist State on part of it. They succeeded in passing that dubious resolution in the General Assembly.

40. The partition resolution [*resolution 181 (II)*], which was founded on corrupt premises, will remain subject to controversy and will be a threat to those living in Palestine or its vicinity if the situation is not rectified and a solution found that preserves the legitimate rights of the people of the country. Here we are again after 38 years, witnessing the continuing importance of the question concerning which the United Nations was misused for the purpose of committing the ugliest of injustices against a people in its own land, and witnessing the oppression increasing in complexity, while the criminal is at large, wreaking havoc in the region.

41. One glance at this farce, through which an attempt was made to determine the destiny of a whole people, coupled with an understanding of the composition of the United Nations today in comparison to that period, demonstrates how inadequate was the capacity of the General Assembly then to represent all the peoples of the world in a real sense and to express the opinions of all those peoples.

42. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations was clear when it stated that one of the objectives of the United Nations is: "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples". That is what the Charter states. What was the destiny of

the Palestinian people? And what were the real positions of the peoples of the world then, at the time of the adoption of the partition resolution, when most of them were under the domination of foreign Powers against their own will?

43. The fact that, in 1947, the United Nations represented the peoples of the world by a ratio of only one to three is one of the main reasons for the tragedy of today. The 102 States that have become Members of the Organization since 1947 and that are now sitting among us expressing the free will of their people, have transformed the General Assembly from an exclusive club of 51 States to a truly international Organization which sees the light and is guided by it. If voting on the resolution on the partition of Palestine were to take place today, when the United Nations far better represents peoples enjoying full independence, the resolution would be defeated by a majority of at least 100 votes. In 1947, it was passed unjustly by a majority of 33 votes in the name of present States Members of the Organization that could not then vote on it. Thus, after 38 years, the question of Palestine remains before the United Nations, while the ferocity of Israeli aggression against the heart of Palestinian Arab society and against the demography of the various parts of the country continues to increase, spreading its evil to the neighbouring Arab countries after having engulfed the West Bank and Gaza. The danger of the Israeli adventures for regional and international security are also greater than ever before. This dangerous situation worsens every day, with each successive day revealing more clearly the malevolent intentions and dangerous schemes threatening the security of individuals and peoples and the peace of the region and the world.

44. After a great deal of suffering the Arabs rightly put forward a peace proposal, which was adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[3] with a view to stabilizing the situation which would make it possible to avoid the danger of the continuance of this perilous conflict. That plan was rejected by all the parties and institutions of the Zionist entity. Here I must ask whether the Zionists really want security, really want peace. If they did, they would have hastened to accept the Arab proposal. They do not want peace and are against security and safety. Their deeds testify to this and their pronouncements confirm it. They say that they want secure borders, but they refuse to define those borders. Where are those borders that they speak of? It is the duty and the right of the General Assembly to challenge the Israeli entity to give us details of the borders that it wants to protect. Or is it that Israel does not want any borders at all, so that the Arab East may remain a quagmire, with open frontiers and sky, where aggressive zionism can run in any direction it wants? The Zionists will have to recognize—probably after it is too late—that their course of action is the swiftest formula for destruction and ruin.

45. The Zionist claim was founded on deception and falsehood, first in Jewish circles and then in international circles, and this has not changed. They deceived the Jews of the world, leading them into believing that the road to Palestine was paved and the distance short. They deceived the world when they said that Palestine was a land without people for a people without a land. Some of the Zionist documents of that period even referred casually to "the presence of some population in the land of Palestine from tribes that lack the characteristics necessary for political existence in the country and represent distant waves of immigration from the Arab world to Palestine, which makes them ineligible for any rights". Today, the Assembly sees the truth of the matter and the extent of the deception the Israelis have practised and continue to practise in order to reach their goals.

46. That is how the Zionist thinking was established in the minds of the adherents of zionism, who were scattered throughout the world before they succeeded, thanks to foreign imperialism, in securing a foothold in Arab land. It was established on the basis of propaganda and political theories based on deception, conspiracy and trickery. Once they had secured a foothold in the country, the Zionists began to practise terrorism of all kinds everywhere and at all levels in order to establish an unjust colonialist entity in the heart of the Arab land.

47. This is a scenario carried out by the Zionists while they usurp a place in the heart of the greater Arab nation and in the centre of the Islamic world, attacking the rights and the sacred shrines of the Arab people from a position of strength imported from outside and supported by Powers that are in all ways foreign, a place that is temporary in nature, no matter how long it may last. It is inevitable that the Arab and Islamic world, through the preponderance of its population, its great numerical superiority, its vast strategic capacity and its accelerated scientific and technological progress, will gain the upper hand one not-too-distant day. Two million Zionists coveting Palestine, or a million Zionists convinced that they can impose a *fait accompli,* are not enough. The last word is with those who really have the right. Violent aggression against their country, their people, their rights and their holy places, the holy places of Muslims and Christians, will only increase the attachment of Arabs and Muslims to their legitimate rights.

48. The Zionists now occupy the whole of Palestine and are controlling Al-Quds and parts of the neighbouring Arab countries. They are also threatening all the Arab and Muslim countries that are not their neighbours. Here we must reflect on the city of Al-Quds, where there is the Al-Aqsa Mosque, whose sanctity they are attempting to defile. They are attempting to change the physical nature of the city and its demographic composition. The Zionists do not care about these traditions. The world outside the Muslim world is not aware how dangerous this attempt is for the security of the region. We take this opportunity to tell the world clearly how serious the Zionists' action in Al-Quds is. They are challenging the sentiments of 1,000 million Muslims concerning this city, and their devotion to it, for it is dear to the heart of every Muslim and every Christian. They should know that the depth of the Islamic world's devotion to Al-Quds will not be influenced by attempts to create Zionist *faits accomplis,* no matter how hard the Zionists try. Moreover, the whole world will see that these attempts will, God willing, work against the achievement of their objectives. I should like to draw the attention of those that support Zionist aggression from afar to the dangerous consequences of the crime against the whole Islamic world in which they are participating. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and all the Islamic States have alerted

the world to the grave repercussions the Zionist schemes in Al-Quds would have.

49. The Arab people of Palestine began their struggle 65 years ago to preserve the identity of their land, their security and the sanctity of their holy places, and to build an independent State in their historical homeland, Palestine.

50. Those that have the right, the Arab people of Palestine, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative, have risen up today to demand once again that the international community fulfil its commitments while they, supported by the entire Arab and Islamic world and all the peoples which uphold justice, are struggling to preserve their rights, because justice is a force in itself and a power that cannot be defeated. Experience has shown that rights that have not been abandoned can never be lost. The Palestinian people will never cease their struggle until they enjoy their legitimate rights in their own land. They are supported and aided in this struggle to the fullest extent by the whole Arab world and the whole Islamic world, as well as by those that uphold justice and right everywhere in the world. We give this advice to those that are bargaining with the Palestinians over those rights and those that are giving unlimited support to the Zionist entity: they must realize how serious is the accumulation of injustices suffered by the Palestinians over the years; yet the Palestinian people and the Arab and Islamic peoples have only become more devoted than ever to the legitimate rights of Arabs and Muslims in Palestine. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the other Arab and Islamic countries, as well as all the peoples of the world which support justice, have no hesitation in fulfilling their responsibility to support Arab and Islamic rights in Palestine until those rights are restored to their true owners.

51. It is more necessary than ever before for the General Assembly to forge a peace based on a clear and exemplary framework and restore to the Palestinians the rights which it participated in violating when its will was alienated. The great Powers, in particular, must realize that the present day is different from that of 29 November 1947, the day the partition resolution [*resolution 181 (II)*] was adopted. As for zionism, after all its experience in violating the rights of the Palestinian Arab people, it is only exposing its entity to danger if it does not respond to the call for what is right. The right of the Palestinian people will inevitably be restored.

52. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The comprehensive solution of the Middle East conflict is one of the important international tasks of our time, and the key to it is undoubtedly a just settlement of the question of Palestine. This problem is highly topical. The enjoyment of their legitimate rights by the Palestinian people remains central to a peace settlement in the Middle East. The dangerous developments under way in the region show that the main obstacle to peace and security in the Middle East is Israel's continued aggression.

53. By using brutal force and perpetrating acts of terror, the Israeli rulers are stepping up the entrenchment of the occupation régime in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Syrian Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. Every day new crimes are added to the innumerable ones committed against the Palestinian people. The world will never forget the bloody massacres at Sabra and Shatila and the act of terror against the Palestinian refugee camp of Ein el-Hilweh. The aim behind the intensified terror is to intimidate the Palestinian population, destroy its communal and social institutions and thereby expel it from its soil. In this way, *faits accomplis* are to be created that will enable Israel finally to incorporate the Palestinian territories.

54. In the Final Communiqué adopted by the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October this year, the Ministers and Heads of Delegation quite rightly

> "expressed their opposition to the continued violation of the rights of the indigenous Arab inhabitants, their forced dispersion and other policies aimed at changing the basic character and legal status of these territories. They affirmed that these practices and policies run contrary to international law and relevant resolutions of the United Nations and were declared on many occasions and in various forums null and void, confirming that Israel is non-peace-loving and should be treated accordingly." [*See A/39/560, para. 55.*]

55. It is therefore only too understandable that this significant communiqué also contains the demand that measures should be applied against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

56. The German Democratic Republic is in agreement with the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations in resolutely condemning once again Israel's continued policy of aggression and occupation.

57. There is growing awareness all over the world that the attitude of the main imperialist Power based on the striving for hegemony is the main reason why, despite the great efforts undertaken by the United Nations and the majority of States, it has not yet been possible to force Israel into ending its policy, which endangers peace, and to restore the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

58. The United States not only ignores the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people but, through its course of confrontation and arms buildup, involving as a major component the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, encourages the Israeli leadership to perpetrate new acts of aggression against Arab States and ruthlessly to enforce its plans for territorial expansion.

59. There can therefore be no doubt that the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel remains a constant threat to peace and to the existence of the Arab peoples. That is why it is now more essential than ever before that all forces that are seriously interested in maintaining international peace and security redouble their efforts in order to expose the objectives of the fateful strategic alliance and to force Israel into abandoning its policy of aggression and occupation and implementing the United Nations resolutions on the question of Palestine.

60. In the communiqué on the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty States, held at Berlin on 3 and 4 December 1984, the following is stated:

> "The States represented at the meeting condemn the imperialist policy of force and manifest their solidarity with and support for the peoples fighting for their freedom, the strengthening of their inde-

pendence and socio-economic progress." [*See A/39/763, annex.*]

61. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, reaffirmed that the right to the establishment of an independent State is the central problem in implementing the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. There is no way to disregard the Palestinian people or to ignore the exercise of its right to self-determination, to the establishment of its own independent State, to return and to compensation. Attempts to reach separate deals or have negotiations without the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO, are incompatible with the interests of the Palestinian people. Guided by this awareness, the overwhelming majority of States is actively committed to ensuring the speediest implementation of the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine.[2]

62. In the light of the anti-peace and aggressive course pursued by Israel and its allies, it is imperative to intensify collective efforts in order to resolutely counter the dangerous developments in the Middle East. In this connection, the German Democratic Republic attaches great importance to the principles and approaches for a Middle East settlement proposed by the Soviet Union on 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*] and fully endorses them. It reiterates from this rostrum its sympathy with and high appreciation of the courageous struggle waged by the Palestinian people. It regards the preservation of the unity and cohesion of the Palestine resistance movement and the creation of a close fighting community of all patriotic Arab forces as a condition for the victory of the just Palestinian cause.

63. In a message sent by the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, to the Secretary-General on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, commemorated on 29 November 1984, the German Democratic Republic reaffirmed its principled position on the Middle East problem and the question of Palestine, as well as its solidarity with the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine:

> "To the German Democratic Republic the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People is a fitting occasion to assure the Palestinian people of its firm solidarity in the struggle for its legitimate rights under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The German Democratic Republic advocates a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict. This requires that the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to the establishment of an independent State, be assured. Israel must without delay withdraw from all territories it has occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem. It is only in this way that peace, security and the independent development of all States and peoples in the region can be ensured.
>
> "The German Democratic Republic emphatically supports the demand of the overwhelming majority of States for the early convocation of an international Middle East conference with the participation of all interested sides, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Israel and the United States must no longer be allowed to scorn world public opinion and to continue blocking the convening of such a conference."

64. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The question of Palestine has been considered by the General Assembly since the creation of the United Nations and has been present on the agenda of every session. Many resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as by other United Nations bodies, regarding the question of Palestine. Despite that, all of those resolutions have remained a dead letter.

65. Nevertheless, the continued consideration by the United Nations of the question of Palestine has not been in vain. The pursuit of this question and the attempt to find solutions to all of its aspects is a moral and historic obligation for the Organization. In fact, to return to the source of the problem it is necessary to go back to the League of Nations, to which the United Nations is heir. The Organization had to play the same major role, and it conferred on the question its new image and form when the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II) on 29 November 1947, a resolution which gave the green light to the resort to force for the usurpation of the larger part of Palestine. It is that brute force, unfortunately, that prevails today in that cherished part of our Arab world.

66. For these reasons and because this situation continues to threaten international peace and security, it is the duty of the United Nations not to lose sight of the question of Palestine for even a moment until a just and comprehensive solution is found that will right the wrongs, respect the right of peoples to self-determination and enable peace to return to this region that has suffered for so long from the scourge of war.

67. The State of Qatar supports and endorses the ceaseless struggle of the fraternal Palestinian people to obtain its legitimate national rights. We stand side by side with this heroic people and its legitimate representative, the PLO, in all efforts to find a just settlement by every means available to it, until such time as the heroic Palestinian people can exercise its legitimate rights and benefit from the rights enjoyed by all peoples of the world, namely, to self-determination and to the establishment of a State of its own on an equal footing with other peoples.

68. The long struggle waged by the Palestinian people against usurpation, aggression and brutal oppression, and the determination of this people to recover its national rights have enjoyed broad international support, manifested each year by the observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, as well as by the great majority endorsing the resolutions that have been adopted condemning the Zionist entity and calling for the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Moreover, many international conferences have adopted resolutions supporting the rights of the Palestinian people. The latest was the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, which adopted the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[2] two important instruments which could serve as a basis for a just solution to the question of Palestine. Noteworthy

was the proposal to convene an international conference on peace in the Middle East in which all interested parties would participate, including the PLO and the permanent members of the Security Council. Most countries of the world supported that proposal. My country hopes that if it is adopted at the present session, everyone will welcome it so that the long-awaited peace in the Middle East can be achieved.

69. We wonder what enables the Zionist entity constantly to defy the international community and its resolutions. The answer to this question is clear to all: it is the unlimited support afforded by certain parties, without regard to its failure to observe the will of the international community and the resolutions of the United Nations.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the Chair.

70. *The New York Times* of 14 October 1984 published an article which emphasized the feeling of security enjoyed by the Zionists. It said:

> "At a dinner here in his honour Tuesday night, Mr. Peres told a story that revealed much about Israel's dependency. He recalled that when former Prime Minister Levi Eshkol was Minister of Agriculture, an aide came to him saying, 'There's some bad news; there's a drought.' Mr. Eshkol asked, 'Where? In Israel or in the United States?' When the aide said, 'In Israel,' Mr. Eshkol sighed with relief and said that as long as it was not in the United States, Israel could manage without trouble. Mr. Peres then went on to say that he was glad it was raining in Washington because the economy in Israel was 'dry'."*

71. The time factor has become so important that we cannot continue to delay serious and effective efforts to find a solution to the question of Palestine as soon as possible. The international community cannot stand idly by as an observer any longer in the face of the unchecked attempts by Israel to liquidate the question of Palestine by creating settlements, confiscating land and modifying the demographic structure of Palestine and the conditions of life in the occupied Palestinian territories; this only encourages Israeli terrorist organizations to try to force the Palestinians to leave their territory and their homeland, as well as the attempts to face the world with a *fait accompli*. Through these actions, Israel is defying the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council with complete impunity. This is why the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, rightly emphasized the importance of the time factor and the need for a just and speedy solution to the question of Palestine.

72. The international community must reaffirm to the Zionist entity that it categorically rejects the acquisition of territories by force and cannot allow a people to be deprived of the right to live on its own land. Whatever attempts Israel may make to erase the Palestinian presence in Palestine, they will not be crowned with success. The lessons of history show this and their meaning is clear. The plundering of lands by armed aggression does not confer any rights upon the aggressor. The denial of the rights of a people through repression and terror cannot force that people to forget or to give up its rights. Peace and security cannot be founded on force. Justice and equity are the sole means of ensuring the security of peoples.

73. My country, like all peace-loving countries that support the rights of peoples, hopes that all States will realize the gravity of the situation resulting from the paralysis surrounding the question of Palestine and the need to find a just and speedy solution. The time for talk is past. It is high time that we acted decisively, without further delay.

74. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): For 37 years, generations of Palestinians have been born under foreign rule and domination or have experienced the plight of refugees. The Palestinian people, like other peoples, are born to be free but are denied their basic rights both as individuals and as a nation.

75. During all those years, we have called for and supported the exercise of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to establish their own State. During all those years, the main issue has remained unchanged: the right to self-determination, to national independence, to protection from the acquisition of foreign territories by force, to return to one's own home and to the establishment of one's own State. For years it has been clear that the exercise of these rights by the Palestinian people is the prerequisite for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

76. This has become a test of the conscience of the United Nations that cannot be evaded any longer. The ideals of self-determination, of national independence, of freedom have become an inspiration and a support for the endeavours to bring about a new, better and more stable world.

77. In the course of contemporary history there have been few examples of a people's suffering for so long and struggling with such determination for their right to exist as is the case with the Palestinian people.

78. During all this time, the Israeli policy of expansion and domination has been an obstacle to the solution of this issue and of the crisis in the Middle East in general. This policy not only inflicts suffering on the Palestinian people but perpetuates the process of mistrust, instability and conflict in the Middle East and beyond. The responsibility of all those that are supporting the policy of expansion and domination, either actively or passively, has become greater with the passage of time.

79. There is a growing consensus that peace in the Middle East cannot be built around the denial of the existence of an entire people or around the denial of the right of the Palestinian people to exist.

80. The international community has become even more determined in its opposition to the use of force and to the acquisition and expansion of foreign territories by Israel. The *faits accomplis* of that policy have never been accepted, nor have the temporary successes of aggression, expansion and the acquisition of territories by force. This would not only be contrary to the basic norms of international law, but also would run counter to the aspirations of peoples to freedom and independence.

81. The West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan Heights and part of Lebanon remain under Israeli occupation. Israel continues to establish illegal settlements on Palestinian and Arab lands and to disregard decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It persistently attempts to resolve the question of Palestine by terror and war. Only recently, it once again sowed death among Palestinian students and youth in the West Bank. It is

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

constantly threatening peace and security in the Middle East and beyond.

82. Palestinians have their ethnic, historic and cultural identity, as well as a political entity expressed through the PLO, its sole and legitimate representative. They are constantly showing their resolve not to give up their right to freedom and self-determination and not to be brought to their knees.

83. The Palestinian people have been dealt with without mercy. They are still being chased from their land, but they have maintained their unity and resolve in the most adverse conditions.

84. They are well aware that history abounds with testimony that those fighting for freedom are stronger than those imposing domination and that nothing attracts the support of other peoples more than determination to persist in the fight for right against the policy that might is right.

85. All those who support the just cause of the Palestinian people were heartened by the recent meeting at Amman of the Palestine National Council. The Palestinian people, through their representatives, reaffirmed once again their unity. They have served warning once again that all attempts to eliminate the Palestinian people, and the PLO as its sole legitimate representative, are bound to fail. They have shown their determination to maintain the independence of their institutions, and they have expressed again their full independence and their full confidence in the PLO and in its leadership, headed by the Chairman of its Executive Committee, Yasser Arafat.

86. It is appropriate to recall at this point the important and substantial work that has been done for the Palestinian cause by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, of which Yugoslavia is a member. The Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, leads that Committee in a dedicated manner and an imaginative way, and the Committee strives consistently to increase the international community's support for the cause of the Palestinian people.

87. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries continues to be the firmest and broadest stronghold of the struggle for freedom and independence of all peoples and countries. From the time of the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in September 1961, more than two decades ago, the non-aligned countries have been steadfast supporters of the struggle of the Palestinian people for self-determination.

88. In their desire to render more effective support to the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people in accordance with the will of the non-aligned countries, they established the Non-Aligned Committee of Eight on Palestine, of which Yugoslavia is a member. This was done in the light of an urgent need to take renewed and concrete steps within the United Nations aimed at resolving the issue of Palestine and the Middle East crisis as a whole.

89. On 3 October 1984, the Committee of Eight, chaired by India, met at the ministerial level. The meeting called for renewed efforts to ensure the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations. It should be recalled that such a conference was envisaged in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983,[2] and endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C. It was felt that such a conference should bring about the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and that it would be the best framework for finding a comprehensive, just and lasting solution.

90. It is encouraging that an overwhelming majority of Member States have pronounced themselves in favour of convening such a conference. It should be stressed again that everything should be done to convene that conference and that it is the responsibility of all international factors to display stronger political will in that regard.

91. The Secretary-General should be supported in his own ongoing efforts aimed at convening this conference.

92. The peoples of Yugoslavia are rendering full support to the proud Palestinian people in its struggle. In conformity with its own policy of independence and non-alignment, Yugoslavia has always considered that the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and that it should participate, on an equal footing, in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the question of Palestine and on the Arab-Israeli conflict. The solution to that question can be based only on the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Arab and Palestinian territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem, as well as on the realization of the Palestinian people's inalienable rights to independence and sovereignty, including the right to their own State and the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes. It must be based, too, on a recognition of the right of all States and peoples in the region to secure national existence and independent social development.

93. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam): The question of Palestine has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for almost four decades. Four decades is indeed a long time for the Palestinian people, who have overcome all hardships and difficulties to wage a heroic struggle for national salvation and for the past, present and future of a peaceful and diligent people. It is Israel that has taken their land, thus forcing them to seek refuge and shelter in foreign countries. It is also Israel that has massacred them in cold blood. The killing of 254 innocent Palestinians at Deir Yassin in April 1948 was only a curtain-raiser. It was followed in July 1948 by the massacre of 580 Palestinians at Dawaymeh. This was recently exposed by *Hadashot*, an Israeli newspaper. Sabra and Shatila will surely not be the last. So long as an independent Palestinian State has not been established in Palestine, there will still exist the displacement of people, the annexation of territory and genocide-like massacre of Palestinians.

94. We have already had the opportunity to express our views on the question of the Middle East. Superficially, that is the question of the Israeli-Arab conflict. But lying at the heart of that conflict is the question of Palestine. Anyone familiar with the situation in the region can see it, and numerous resolutions of the United Nations and of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, reaffirm it.

95. The essence of the question of Palestine is the war of aggression and annexation waged by Israel against the Palestinian people and, logically, the latter's struggle for national liberation and for the establishment of an independent State of its own in Palestine. In the last four decades, these people have been held hostage to perfidious intrigues; they have become the most direct victims of Israel's zionism and expansionism. Zionism resorts to violence and sheer force of arms to impose its will on other peoples, first and foremost the Palestinian people. Violence has become a pattern of Israel's expansionist policy towards achieving the ultimate goal of setting up a "Greater Israel". The Israeli authorities want to annihilate the Palestinian resistance forces under their juggernaut of war; they wish to terminate the existence and identity of the Palestinians as a people. Therefore, within days of Israel's birth, over one million Palestinians were uprooted and forced out of their land. Subsequent wars have scattered them further, from Africa to Europe, and to other Arab countries. These wars also serve a subsidiary purpose: the Israeli authorities mean to threaten the Arab countries into ending their help and assistance to the Palestinian people, for the message is clear that Israel will use violence against those countries that give refuge and shelter to the Palestinians.

96. In recent years, Israel has stepped up the establishment of settlements in the areas under its occupation. These settlers are protected by Israeli armed forces and they themselves are allowed to carry firearms and to kill the Palestinians at will. Newspapers have reported recent killings of students and peaceful demonstrators against Israel's policy of settlements and its attempts to destroy East Jerusalem, a sacred site for all Muslims. We denounce and condemn in the strongest terms these criminal acts by Israel and demand that it put an immediate end to its inhumane practices against innocent people.

97. The United States must also bear responsibility for Israel's acts. We are not going to rake up old scores, from its hasty recognition of Israel only hours after the latter's birth, or its connivance as an accomplice of Israel in the wars against the Palestinian and Arab people, to the presence of its armed forces in the region and in adjacent areas. We simply refer to its strategic alliance and its devotion to Israel's fate. The United States has provided Israel with billions of dollars and all kinds of modern weapons. Its financial support, military aid and political protection have enabled Israel to step up its wars of aggression and annexation, to speed up its settlements in occupied areas and to be more aggressive and obstinate in its defiance of United Nations resolutions and international law. In its role as the regional gendarme, Israel has rendered service to the United States global strategy.

98. Yet the United States and its most important ally in the Middle East have never achieved their goals. Their attempt to sow division among Arab countries has failed. The Palestinian resistance forces cannot be annihilated as they expected. The Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole authentic and legitimate representative, have enjoyed the firm and concrete support and assistance of the Arab and international communities in their intensified struggle against the Israeli aggressors. The Palestinian fighters are admired and respected for their endurance and heroism in their resistance against Israel's forces in Beirut, in Tripoli, in the Bekaa Valley and elsewhere. The struggle of the Palestinian people has now taken on new dimensions and has gained even more support and sympathy.

99. The international community has really shown deep understanding and has made great contributions, particularly in the fields of education, health services and humanitarian relief, in order to alleviate the sustained suffering of these people. But no matter how great and important these generous activities are, they are only palliatives that cannot solve on a long-term basis the central issue of the Middle East conflict, that is, the question of Palestine. The root cause of the deadlock in the situation in the Middle East and in the settlement of the Palestine question, and hence the prolonged tension in the region, is the United States policy of aggression and intervention, either directly or with Israel as its instrument. It is clear that the United States "peace plans" can never solve the problem; the process of Camp David can only lead to deadlock. There will be no breakthrough; there will be no peace and security in the Middle East so long as the question of Palestine has not been solved. To do so, Israel must stop its policy of state terrorism and territorial annexation. It must respect the fundamental national rights of the Palestinian people, their right to self-determination, including the right to return and to establish an independent State of their own in Palestine. The two entwined questions, that is, the question of the Middle East and the question of Palestine, should be settled through a peaceful comprehensive solution which ensures Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and respect for the legitimate interests of all countries in the region—and Palestine must be one of those countries. Such a solution can be achieved only through the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties concerned on an equal footing, including the PLO, the United States and the Soviet Union. Such a conference has been envisaged in the relevant resolutions of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly and by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in 1983. The proposals by the Soviet Union of 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*] serve as a good basis for the conference on the Middle East, for they have settled the principles and modalities for the conference, thereby enjoying the support of public opinion. So far, the only obstacle to the convening of such a conference is the negative attitude and reaction of the United States and Israel, and we must condemn them for that.

100. The delegation of Viet Nam once again commends the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to bring about the convening of an international conference on the Middle East. Special credit should also be given to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for its efforts to mobilize world public opinion and solidarity with and material support for the just cause of the Palestinian people, and for its exhaustive report and up-to-date information on the situation concerning the plight of these people. We fully support the strict implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which, among other things, call for the total boycotting and isolation of Israel and an end to any form of relations with Israel. We support the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,

approved by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine,[2] held at Geneva last year. We are pleased to say that we have joined the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolutions which the Committee has worked out in detail.

101. In conclusion, I would like to quote from the message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, addressed to the Secretary-General and to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, commemorated on 29 November of this year:

> "The people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam constantly and resolutely support the just struggle of the Palestinian people for its sacred, inalienable national rights, including the right to self-determination and the right to return to its homeland and to establish a sovereign, independent State of Palestine. The proposal put forth recently by the Soviet Union on convening an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties concerned, including the PLO, is a reasonable and practical proposal aimed at finding a proper solution to the Middle East and Palestine question."

102. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): Another year has elapsed since the Assembly last debated the question of Palestine without as yet any significant change in the situation for the better.

103. Another year has elapsed with Israel persisting in its policies of occupation, annexation and the systematic establishment of new illegal settlements.

104. Another year has elapsed with Israel tightening its oppressive grip over the civilian Arab population of the occupied territories, in disregard of the relevant international conventions.

105. Another year has elapsed, only to remind us that the question of Palestine has been and still remains unquestionably the most striking and costly failure of the United Nations since its inception.

106. My delegation, in speaking this year, too, does not simply wish to reiterate the firm support of the Turkish nation and Government for the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian Arab people, who for decades have been looking to the United Nations for the elimination of the unwarranted barriers preventing them from exercising their inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination and to establish their own independent State. We wish to underline once again that more than enough time has been consumed and sufficient suffering has been endured in the Middle East, particularly by the Palestinian Arab people, for the parties directly or closely involved in this dispute to think about respecting each other's existence and legitimate rights—an unavoidable prerequisite in order to achieve a realistic, comprehensive and viable peace in this important region of the world.

107. The Turkish people and Government, which admire the determination of the Palestinian Arab people to maintain their national rights and identity against all odds, are convinced that there is no sensible alternative for the people and Governments of the Middle East. To choose confrontation to the end and to further bear the manifold political, material and moral burden inevitably resulting from the ongoing state of affairs would not benefit any party, including Israel, in the long run. As a neighbouring country of the region, we strongly believe that this state of affairs can be changed for the better if only realism, political courage and mutual respect prevail over mutual distrust, fanaticism and short-sighted considerations.

108. In this connection, we are of the opinion that it is incumbent upon the Israeli Government, first and foremost, to reassess the situation in its proper historical and political perspective, with a forward-looking approach, and to heed the repeated and unequivocal calls from the United Nations for Israel to withdraw to and live in peace and security within its pre-June-1967 borders.

109. We believe that Israel owes a forthcoming attitude both to this world body, to which it owes its original existence, and to the future generations that will cohabit the Middle East. We are not prepared to admit that any Government on earth can think itself empowered to condemn, if it so chooses, its society and, moreover, neighbouring societies, to inhaling fear and exhaling hatred indefinitely. We are not prepared to admit that any Government can have enough reasons to throw its weight behind the continued exacerbation of explosive tensions when peace is certainly not beyond its reach.

110. It is with this understanding that we call on Israel to quit its intransigent stand and consider, with vision instead of prejudice, the opportunities that an international peace conference on the Middle East, as foreseen by the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[2] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, and called for in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, can indeed offer to Israel, on the one hand, and to Arab States and the PLO, on the other.

111. It is in the same frame of mind that we would like to add our voice to the voices of those delegations that have urged the other parties concerned which have not yet expressed their readiness to participate in the peace-making process, as outlined in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and resolution 38/58 C, to reconsider their respective positions and give new and favourable thought to the holding of the international peace conference on the Middle East.

112. The core of this problem is the question of Palestine, which, particularly during the last 17 years, has been rendered even more acute and complex, both politically and socially.

113. The Turkish Government is of the opinion that any flexible attitude by one of the parties directly involved must be reciprocated by the other parties concerned, including, of course, the PLO, which is the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The beginning of such a trend not only would be conducive to putting an end to the ordeal of the Palestinian people and pave the way for a comprehensive Middle East peace, but also would be an achievement with which the United Nations could crown its 40 years of existence.

114. We would like to add that other initiatives susceptible to bringing a just and honourable peace to the Middle East would also enjoy Turkey's firm support and encouragement, provided that they encompassed the basic principles enunciated repeatedly in the United Nations resolutions pertaining to the question of Palestine. We should like to recall in this regard the Arab peace plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Con-

ference.[3] We have been following with interest the recent political activity in the region. In this context, we are of the opinion that the proceedings of the meeting held at Amman and the ensuing decisions taken by the PLO constitute positive steps in the Middle East scene. The problem has acquired such dimensions over the years and the plight of the Palestinian Arab people is so tremendously embarrassing for humanity as a whole that, in our view, particularly, those who prefer not to offer new ideas at this stage should at least consider, without prejudice, the merits that initiatives taken by others may well have. The fact should not be lost sight of, also, that time, which some may be construing to be on their side, may prove not to be a reliable ally. As we stated on 27 November [*74th meeting*], in the debate on the situation in the Middle East, we believe the time is now ripe to give a fresh impetus to the search for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

115. Mr. BENJELLOUN (Morocco) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The question of Palestine has been the focus of interest of the General Assembly since the United Nations was created. The unhappy reality is that the Organization is responsible for the present situation obtaining in Palestine, an unparalleled responsibility in the history of all contemporary issues. Despite the serious error that was committed by the General Assembly in 1947 against the rights of the Palestinian people and its rights to its own territories and property and to sovereignty over its own land with its wealth and resources, we appreciate the efforts that have been made by the United Nations recently to correct the errors of the past and to restore those rights to the Palestinian people.

116. The great interest shown by the international community in the question of Palestine is ample proof of its full awareness of the injustice of which the Palestinian people are victim and of the necessity of supporting the restoration of its rights and its determination to struggle to recover them fully. The opposition of the international community to Israel's aggressive policy, which is based on brute force, displacement of populations and denial of the most elementary rights to the peoples who have lived in this region for thousands of years, is a sign of a positive change that has taken place in the attitude of the international community towards the question of Palestine.

117. The question of Palestine, which is the very heart of the Middle East tragedy, is a matter of justice and of the denial of justice and right; it is a problem of a people which has been expelled from its lands, driven into exile by brute force, and even in its exile subjected to attempts to annihilate it physically and politically. The massacres of Palestinians at Sabra and Shatila, in Lebanon, are striking proof of this. For about 40 years this people has known trial after trial; it still waits for the international community to assist it in correcting the errors of the past, permitting the recovery of its usurped rights and creating conditions which would make possible a return to its homeland and the establishment of its own independent State.

118. We are gratified to note that the General Assembly has once again embarked upon the path of justice and law. In 1974 it adopted its historic resolution 3236 (XXIX), in which it reaffirmed the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, and its undeniable right to independence, to sovereignty and to form its own independent State in its own territory. At successive sessions of the Assembly, those inalienable rights were further confirmed, and recognition was also given to the right of the Palestinian people to be considered a principal party in any efforts aimed at establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

119. The Security Council, which is responsible for maintaining international peace and security, has also assumed its role by condemning Israeli practices in Palestine in all their aspects, particularly the policy of creating settlements, which is aimed at altering the demographic composition of occupied Palestine. The Security Council has also frequently requested that the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people be restored and that their lands be recovered.

120. Despite this widespread international support for the Palestinian people, Israel continues to scorn the resolutions of the United Nations and to persist in its policy of occupation, annexation, terror, collective punishment, removal of elected officials, profanation of holy places, burning of harvests and destruction of houses: all these are practices which have been condemned by international law. This is the challenge which Israel has thrown down to the international community, capped by its annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem, the cradle of revealed religions, which it has declared to be its capital in perpetuity. This challenge was to be seen clearly in the measures adopted to Judaize this holy city and to modify its historic and cultural sites in order to obliterate all traces of the past attesting to the Arab nature of the region and the fact that it belongs organically to the Arab communities who have always lived there and who have embraced both Islam and Christianity.

121. It is strange to see the leaders of the Zionist entity continuing to seek to justify their policies of annexation, expansion and terror against the indigenous population by obsolete historical arguments. We still hear them speak of the need to set up a greater Israel and the third kingdom of David, as if time had stopped 4,000 years ago. While Israel puts forward its historic rights to justify what it calls the right of Jews to return to Palestine, it arrogantly denies those same rights to the Palestinians who were driven from their land and their homes only a few years ago.

122. In order to entrench this tragic situation, Israel persists in its policy of threats and terror and is stockpiling destructive weapons in the region of the Middle East, thus threatening the security of the region and international peace and security. This policy could also cause a fifth war, the consequences of which would not be confined to the Middle East.

123. We can deal with this dangerous situation only on the basis of international law, equity and justice and by restoring the rights of the Palestinian people, in accordance with the many relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations over the years.

124. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held last year at Geneva under the auspices of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, gave a further opportunity for the international community to call anew for the speedy implementation of the relevant resolutions adopted by various international bodies. In this context, we would request the United Nations, whose responsibility it is to protect international law, and all States that are concerned for peace

and security in the region, to shoulder their responsibility and work to ensure respect for the resolutions, in particular the provisions calling for the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

125. The Palestinian people, whose historic past has shed a cultural and religious light, is an authentic people which will never give up its inalienable rights. The aspirations of the Palestinian people to freedom and its determination to throw off the Zionist yoke and fully to recover its rights are legitimate aspirations recognized by international bodies and by the international community. The PLO is the defender of these aspirations, because it is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. It is entrusted with the fulfilment of the hopes of the Palestinian people and of its political will. That is why that organization is the main and only negotiating partner in all questions relating to the Palestinian people in general.

126. The Kingdom of Morocco had the honour of hosting, at Fez, the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, which adopted unanimously, on 9 September 1982, an Arab peace plan—better known as the Fez plan[3]—to settle the question of Palestine and the Middle East. Also, at the beginning of this year my country welcomed at Casablanca the Fourth Islamic Summit Conference. King Hassan II, who is Chairman of the Al-Quds Committee of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, has asked me to take this opportunity to reaffirm his total and unconditional support for the just, legitimate and heroic struggle of the Palestinian people, under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, the PLO, to recover its inalienable rights, return to its homeland and establish an independent State in the land of Palestine.

127. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Observer of the League of Arab States, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V).

128. Mr. EL-FARRA (Observer, League of Arab States) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Another year has elapsed and the question of Palestine is still included on the agenda of the General Assembly. Another year has elapsed and the renewed debates and continued stumbling efforts to settle this question serve only as striking proof of the inability of the international community to establish a just peace in our world and enable this people struggling for freedom and dignity to regain its right of self-determination. Another year has elapsed and the question of Palestine remains without a solution, even though it is the core of the conflict in the Middle East. The dimensions of that situation have spread and branched out to threaten the peace and security of the peoples not only of the region but of the whole world.

129. I will not recapitulate here the events relating to the question of Palestine that have occurred during the past year. I will refer only to the principal realities that those events revealed, for in this way we may be able to shed light on the necessity and importance of convening an international peace conference and thereby show that any delay in convening such a conference will impede the achievement of peace and security in a region which is one of the most volatile in the world, and the recovery by its people of their inalienable rights, of which they have been deprived.

130. The first reality is that Israel does not in any way want a peace based on international legitimacy. Israel has rejected all initiatives aimed at the establishment of a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in our region. It has become clear that this rejection is connected with the substance of these initiatives, not with their form. By rejecting the principles which this international body has established, basically, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and of rewarding the aggressor for its aggression, Israel denies the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people, the owner of the land.

131. Israel has taken measures, which have been denounced as illegal, to annex Jerusalem and proclaim it the "eternal capital" of Israel and to annex the Syrian Golan Heights. The General Assembly is thus clearly aware of Israeli efforts to prepare the necessary conditions for annexing what remains of the occupied territory in perpetuation of the occupation and the imposition of a *fait accompli*.

132. One of the clearest manifestations of those practices, which constitute the real reason for Israel's opposition to all peace initiatives and make it oppose them so fiercely and work against their implementation, is the expulsion of the inhabitants and the confiscation of their lands to achieve the objectives of zionism.

133. The occupied Arab territories have been and remain the scene of continuous oppression of the Palestinian people through the proliferation of terrorist organizations established by the Israeli settlers, with the protection and support of the Israeli occupying authorities, in order to create a material and psychological situation that compels the Palestinian citizens to leave their lands. Those terrorist organizations conducted acts that are considered to be, in scope and severity, proof of a new campaign similar to the one that accompanied the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. Israeli laws have been applied to the Israeli settlers in the occupied Arab territories and this has created a state of duality between the legal situation of the natives and that of the settlers.

134. Moreover, the colonial settlement movement has intensified in the Arab lands that have been confiscated. Through coercive Zionist practices, the Israeli occupation authorities are seeking to Judaize Palestinian territory, destroy its Arab heritage, expel its inhabitants and distort its history.

135. The confiscation of water resources in the occupied territories constitutes one of the most dangerous manifestations of these practices and one of the main reasons for the intensification of tension in the region. Israel's continued effort to monopolize the water resources with the aim of exploiting them in the service of its colonial settlements has always been an incentive for its aggression and expansion.

136. In this respect, the Israeli terrorists who massacre peaceful civilians, including women and children, are an army whose task is to commit terrorist acts not only on the land of Palestine but throughout the Arab lands. The injustice suffered by the Palestinian people with respect to their right to return and to independence, the daily practices against them in their towns and villages or in their camps, and the air, sea and land raids which are being carried out in the region and by means of which Israel threatens all Arab countries—all are taking place because there is a bridge connecting Israel to the United States and supplying the necessary financing to protect its conquests and underwrite its military operations, as well as the arms needed to launch its attacks and create destabilization and trouble in the region.

137. Such practices and injustices could come to an end if the United States used its financial leverage to put pressure on Israel to stop practising terrorism and to participate in the structuring of a just peace in the region.

138. I wish to point out that the United States bears direct responsibility for the failure of efforts towards a just peace in our region because of Israel's rejection of all the peace initiatives and its obstinacy in its contempt for the international will. The United States, through its special relations with Israel, which it has developed extensively in the past few years, has chosen complete alignment with Israel. The most conspicuous development has been the agreement on economic assistance to Israel and on strengthening American-Israeli co-operation and co-ordination in the military and strategic fields, not to mention the unlimited political support enjoyed by Israel in its acts of aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab States.

139. The Charter of the United Nations has given the United States, as a great Power, special responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security; yet, as a permanent member of the Security Council, the United States is preventing the United Nations from playing its role in achieving peace. In his report, the Secretary-General draws attention to the letter from the representative of the United States to the President of the Security Council, dated 13 January 1984, in reply to his invitation to the United States to participate in an international peace conference on the Middle East. The reply was as follows: "The United States considers the recommendation of a Middle East Peace Conference in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C to be ill-considered and harmful." [*A/39/130, annex III, appendix.*]

140. The total American alignment with Israel, an occupying, expansionist and terrorist force, has curtailed the capacity of the United States to participate, as a mediator, in the achievement of a just settlement in the Middle East and further diminishes the chances for peace in the region. Real peace, with all its elements of justice, permanence and comprehensiveness, will not be achieved with this imbalance. We ask the United States—which gave the world Presidents such as Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson and Eisenhower, who, through their struggle, exemplified the values of freedom and equality—as a great Power with special interests that it needs to defend, to take big and courageous steps to correct the imbalance in its current relations with the parties to the conflict in the region. This is the only way for it to regain the credibility and effectiveness that would enable it to fulfil its role; and it is the only way to increase the opportunities for success of the efforts exerted towards settling the conflict that has been going on in our region for several decades, and to remove the current elements of instability and complexities in the region.

141. I wish also to point out that the Arab countries, with the Palestinians in the forefront, have proved beyond doubt that they are calling for peace. They have done this through the many initiatives they have proposed or accepted. The Arab countries, including the Palestinian people with the PLO as their sole legitimate representative, unanimously specified in the decisions adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[3] their concept of the peace process, based on international legitimacy and in harmony with the international will as reflected in United Nations resolutions. Those resolutions have taken into account the realities of the situation in the region and have included the principles that constitute an objective starting-point for the establishment of a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the region, such as the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of a sovereign State in their homeland.

142. The Arab countries and the PLO have declared their acceptance of the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983,[2] and have said that they are ready to participate in the international peace conference which the General Assembly has recommended to settle the situation in the Middle East. Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, in his speech at the opening meeting of the latest session of the Palestine National Council, stated that: "The PLO supports the idea of holding an international peace conference on the Middle East attended by all parties concerned, on the basis of United Nations resolutions and the resolutions of the Arab Summit Conference at Fez."

143. This belief in the need to establish peace in the region is not surrender. The Arab countries and the Palestinian people would never give up their freedom or dignity or their conviction of the need for peace itself and for achieving the rights that the international community has acknowledged to be legitimate.

144. Despite all the efforts exerted by zionism prior to or after the establishment of the State of Israel to destroy the Palestinians' national identity, to erase their feeling of belonging to the Arab homeland and nation and to deny them their rights, the Israelis have not destroyed the will and hopes of the Palestinians for a life in freedom and dignity, nor their capacity for resistance and struggle, which they continue to demonstrate in order to preserve their identity and their right to self-determination. In the occupied Arab territories there is daily testimony to their sacrifices.

145. The Palestinian resistance in the occupied Palestinian territories and the Lebanese struggle in southern Lebanon are living proof of the fact that the forces of resistance will never accept a *fait accompli* or any other situation that is not in keeping with a just, lasting and comprehensive peace; nor will they lose faith in the inevitability of the attainment of such peace through their struggle and refusal to surrender. This is the lesson we have learned from the experience of all peoples that have struggled for their sacred rights and which today constitute the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations.

146. Finally, any peaceful settlement of the conflict in the region requires that we take into consideration the following elements in achieving a just, lasting and comprehensive peace. These elements are the outcome of a long struggle and various peace initiatives based on international legitimacy and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

147. First, peace cannot be achieved through expansion. He who seeks peace must abandon a policy of occupation, colonization, aggression and expansion. This means that any peace that does not encompass withdrawal from all the occupied lands,

including Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, would be unsuccessful.

148. Secondly, security cannot be achieved through expansion, for expansion, aggression and the denial of the rights of other peoples are the basic source of the threat to peace and the increase of conflict. The security of one party can never be achieved at the expense of the other, nor can security be achieved through aggressive terrorist practices and through depriving the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights.

149. Thirdly, the rights of the Palestinian people in their homeland and country are sacred and inalienable. First among these is the right to self-determination and the right to establish their own independent State in Palestine. Attempts to deny those rights have always been the major reason for all the tensions, conflicts and disputes that have characterized the region for many years.

150. Fourthly, the people of Palestine have their own organization, the PLO, their sole legitimate representative, which is the expression of their free will and to which and to the leadership of which they remain loyal. The PLO, despite all the acts of aggression and the challenges aimed at it and the attempts to paralyse it, is still capable of absorbing all those challenges and attacks because of the clarity of its strategy and the democratic system which governs relations among the various forces and political trends represented within it. The challenges facing the PLO have only strengthened its determination and its cohesiveness, its insistence on its objectives and its struggle to achieve them. The Palestine National Council, at its recent session, provided the best evidence of the way it has been working towards these goals.

151. A revolution which functions openly and is capable of holding meetings of its national council in the presence of television cameras, journalists and foreign delegations, and which is willing to discuss its problems frankly before its people and only a few kilometres away from its enemies—such a revolution has proved its ability fully to shoulder its responsibilities.

152. Lastly, it is essential that an international conference on peace in the Middle East be convened as soon as possible. The PLO, as the sole legitimate representative chosen by the Palestinian people, must participate on an equal footing with all other parties in that conference and in any settlement of the situation in the region that is aimed at achieving a just, lasting and comprehensive peace.

153. These facts, summaries and results are very clear to any observer of the situation in our region today. They require us to pool our efforts and take firm stands in support of international legitimacy, in an effort to maintain the credibility of the United Nations and avoid any additional suffering and disasters in our region that has suffered for so long.

154. In conclusion, I wish to recall something Mahatma Gandhi once said:

> "There were once many tyrants, oppressors and killers who for long appeared to be so powerful that they could never be defeated. But in the end they fell. Let us always remember this: throughout history, honesty and love have always triumphed."

Yes, that was the doctrine of Mahatma Gandhi, which summed up the experiences of man throughout his long history. That today is also the Palestinians' concept of their cause, their hopes, their rights and their future.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[3] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

91st PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 7 December 1984, at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: Four draft resolutions have been submitted under this item [*A/39/L.37 to L.40*].

2. Mr. NDONGO (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Since the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, many countries and peoples, one after another, have achieved freedom and dignity.

3. The same does not hold true for the Palestinian people, which still today does not enjoy its inalienable rights. Indeed, without consultation with the Palestinians and in contradiction of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, according to which "The wishes of [the] communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory", Palestine was put under a British Mandate. Moreover, five years before that Mandate, Great Britain had committed itself to promoting the establishment of a "national Jewish homeland" in Palestine, a country with which the Zionist leaders claimed a "historic tie".

4. After the revelation of the Sykes-Picot agreement by the Soviet Union and the contradictory statements made by the British Government, including the Balfour Declaration, the Palestinian Arabs energetically opposed the Mandate. At the end of the Second World War, acts of violence were carried out by the Jewish community.

5. Alleging that the Mandate imposed contradictory obligations on it, Great Britain, after 25 years of administration in Palestine, put the issue before the United Nations—which had just been created—proposing the division of Palestine into two independent States: one a Palestinian Arab State and the other a Jewish State, the City of Jerusalem being internationalized. Peace was not restored and Palestine continued to be in a state of upheaval. Thus a war broke out in the Middle East which was halted only through United Nations intervention. One of the two States envisaged in the partition plan, having proclaimed its independence under the name of Israel, during a series of wars proceeded to expand its control over all of Palestine.

6. The Arab State of Palestine never saw the light of day, and since that time the Palestinian people has never ceased struggling to regain its lost rights. Successive wars and acts of destruction, in particular since 1948, have forced millions of Palestinians to embark upon the road of exile and the United Nations to seek a solution to the Palestinian problem, which constitutes "a grave danger for international peace and security".

7. Abused by the expansionist and Zionist régime of Israel, wandering from country to country and shunted off into refugee camps—such is the sad plight of the Palestinian people.

8. But that did not suffice. For mendacious reasons of security, in 1967 the Israeli Zionist régime decided to annex some areas of neighbouring Arab countries in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan.

9. Nor was the Holy City of Jerusalem spared; the occupying force has declared it the capital of Israel. As we are all aware, the problem of Palestine lies at the heart of the tragedy of the Middle East.

10. The difficulty of finding a just, equitable and satisfactory solution to the problem of Palestine is compounded by the fact that, in defiance of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] and the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land,[2] and despite numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, the Commission on Human Rights, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, Israel is pursuing with impunity its policy of collective and individual retaliation, criminal acts, intimidation, arbitrary arrest and imprisonment without right to counsel.

11. In proceeding to expel populations from various regions, the occupying force is trying to destroy the demographic and geographic unity of the Palestinians, thus trampling underfoot General Assembly resolutions 194 (III) and 513 (VI). There is no need to recall here that, despite its arrogance and unjustified stubbornness, Israel has an obligation to respect the rules of the international community and in particular the Charter of the United Nations. It is obliged to do so for it has itself suffered and it owes its very existence to a General Assembly resolution. Hence it is hardly fitting that it should force the Arab people to suffer those very atrocities to which its own people fell victim.

12. As some can see, this Zionist policy is based on the theory of a régime which intends to pursue the application of colonialism through settlements and a frenzied expansionism which believes that the use of terror is the best means for achieving its sordid plans.

13. It is perfectly clear that no progress can be made until Israel ends its policy of annexation and occupa-

tion of Arab and Palestinian territories and its habitual behaviour of violating the rights of the population of those territories.

14. The problem of the Palestinian refugees flows from the Israeli occupation of Arab territories. At present we see the emergence of the fourth generation of Palestinian refugees of the diaspora. The Israeli authorities, not satisfied with pursuing their policy of uprooting populations, have added to this saga of persecution acts of aggression and raids against refugee camps and even massacres such as those of Sabra and Shatila.

15. In each case those acts of oppression are alleged to be the result of the struggle—the legitimate and permanent struggle—waged by the Palestinian people. Is it not a law of nature that any occupation by force, any invasion, brings in its wake resistance to it? Thus the Congolese delegation can only encourage and support those peace-loving people in their will to reconquer their lands.

16. For this reason we pay tribute to the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*], the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people, for the heroic struggle it is waging, despite the difficulties it has always encountered on the road towards its final objective—the liberation of its people. The Congo condemns any attempt to divide and weaken that organization through fratricidal struggles. More than ever, the Palestinian people places its hopes in a PLO which is ever strengthened by its cohesion, unity and commitment.

17. The Congolese delegation supports the idea put forward by the United Nations of convening an international conference on the Middle East, at which all parties in conflict would be represented, including the PLO, and in which the two great Powers would take an active part.

18. The time is more than ever ripe for the international community to deal resolutely with the implementation of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which guarantees the return of the Palestinian refugees to their country, for those who have been forced to leave occupied Palestine have only one desire: to return to their native land and to live in peace, dignity and respect for their national identity.

19. My delegation would like to repeat here the terms of the Final Communiqué adopted by the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984. In that communiqué, the Ministers

> "condemned any agreement or treaty which violates or infringes the rights of the Arab nation and the Palestinian people as recognized by the Non-Aligned Movement, and in accordance with international law, the United Nations Charter and its relevant resolutions and which prevents the liberation of Jerusalem and the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories and the full exercise of, and attainment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights." [*See A/39/560, para. 50.*]

Finally, the Ministers "recalled that the summit conferences had called upon the Security Council to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and facilitate their achievement" [*ibid., para. 52*].

20. As long as the occupation of Arab territories continues and as long as the Palestinian people is unable to enjoy its inalienable rights—its right to self-determination, its right to return and its right to the establishment of a sovereign State—my delegation will have no choice other than to denounce and condemn the atrocities perpetrated against that peace-loving people.

21. Mr. MBYE (Gambia): The central factor in the complex question of Palestine concerns the fundamental principle of self-determination and human rights. Stated simply, it concerns the rights of the people of a given territory—Palestine—to decide for themselves their own political destiny. It is to my delegation a source of pain that the Zionist State of Israel and its backers continue to behave as if the people of Palestine were not deserving of enjoyment of the same rights as others and at times to pretend to make a specific exception of them.

22. Thirty-seven years after the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 181 (II), which provided, *inter alia*, for the creation of a Palestinian State, the people of Palestine still remain without a State. They have instead been collectively reduced to the status of refugees, a whole generation of whom have grown up in camps, dispersed in various States of the Middle East.

23. The land of Palestine is a geographical and historical fact that is not easily erased. Good parts of it are to be found in the West Bank and Gaza, which Israel has occupied illegally since 1967. It is in those territories that the most poignant chapters of the Palestinian tragedy are being enacted. There Israel has embarked on a process of progressive absorption, aimed at nothing less than the ultimate annexation of those territories. To that end, the most ruthless methods of coercion have been employed to scuttle Arab businesses and to expropriate lands owned and farmed by Palestinians for generations. On top of such totally unwholesome activities, Israel has cynically and deliberately set about the task of transforming the demographic composition of the illegally occupied territories.

24. Gambia condemns the odious settlement policy being pursued by Israel, a system that is literally designed to inundate the area with colonial settlers. We cannot but be struck by the similarities between its policy and that adopted by another pariah régime to the vexatious issue of population statistics. I refer, of course, to the diabolical racist régime in South Africa and its heinous policy of bantustanization.

25. The ominous trend of events in the West Bank over the past year has clearly highlighted the gravity of the circumstances in which the sons and daughters of Palestine are compelled to exist. These events are epitomized by the series of terrorist outrages perpetrated against a variety of Arab individuals and institutions. In the past, the Israeli authorities have tried to dismiss such atrocities as the random work of mentally unstable persons. However, the planned grenade attack upon the Dome of the Rock Mosque in January and the narrowly averted bomb attack on Arab buses in Jerusalem last April have demonstrated beyond doubt the existence of an underground Jewish terror network rejoicing in the sinister acronym TNT ("Terror Against Terror"). It is moreover evident that this terrorist network enjoys close ties with extremist settler groups. My delegation therefore views with the gravest misgivings the election to the Knesset of Rabbi Kahane, whose racist "Kach" group has openly advocated the mass

expulsion of all Palestinian Arabs from the occupied territories.

26. It will, of course, be recalled that Jewish settlers, in their relations with the Arab population of the occupied territories, have always been encouraged to take the law into their own hands. This has conveniently tied in with official attempts to eradicate any and all manifestations of Palestinian nationalism on the part of the Arab population. Thus, the perpetrators of the 1980 car-bomb attacks on the three West Bank mayors have yet to be identified. Similarly, even where Jewish settlers have been apprehended *in flagrante delicto*, they have tended to receive only the mildest punishment. The wave of bombings and other terrorist outrages which we have witnessed in the recent past is, then, attributable to the passive indulgence that Israel has maintained towards crimes committed by settlers. This indulgence, incidentally, was acknowledged in the Karp report, issued earlier this year.

27. Not even this ordeal of terror, however, has succeeded in quenching the ardent yearning of the Palestinian people for its birthright. Instead, it remains committed to the cherished ideal of an independent Palestinian State. In this regard, my delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the PLO and to congratulate it on the recent successful meeting at Amman of the Palestine National Council. Our heartfelt congratulations go also to Chairman Yasser Arafat for graciously accepting the verdict of the Palestinian people that he should continue to be at the head of the courageous struggle for their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

28. My Government fully supports the praiseworthy efforts being exerted by the Secretary-General in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C on the convening of a Middle East conference, under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all parties directly involved in the conflict, including, of course, the PLO, which must be involved at all stages as an equal partner.

29. On the fundamental question of Palestine, we must reiterate that only the PLO, the sole representative of the Palestinian people, can negotiate for that people. If a durable peace is to be achieved in the Middle East, there must be an independent Palestinian State, through the restitution of the Palestinians' ancestral lands, usurped by Israel.

30. I cannot conclude without paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and his colleagues for the valuable contribution they continue to make to the drive to secure a just settlement of the Palestine question.

31. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): This year marks a decade since the General Assembly adopted resolution 3236 (XXIX), appropriately elevating the cause of the Palestinian people for self-determination and independent statehood to an issue of major concern to the international community in its own right. In a concomitant decision [*resolution 3237 (XXIX)*], the Assembly accorded recognition to the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, by granting it observer status at the United Nations. The establishment of the Committee on the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People the following year completed the process of bringing the question of Palestine into full focus. As a result of those historic decisions, the question of the national rights of the Palestinian people was removed from the rubric of humanitarian concerns, under which it had been subsumed, and was recognized as the very core of the Middle East conflict.

32. Through the ensuing years and in consecutive sessions, the United Nations has considered this issue in that proper perspective. The convening at Geneva, from 29 August to 7 September 1983, of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine was yet another high point in the reflection of this fundamental reorientation. The Conference, attended by the vast majority of Member States, once again showed international solidarity to be firmly on the side of the struggle of the Palestinian people for national independence, for peace and for human dignity. The Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights, adopted at the Conference,[3] set in motion a broad and far-reaching initiative to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East. Subsequently, at its thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 38/58 C, endorsing the proposed peace conference and thereby bringing the universal authority of the United Nations to bear on establishing a rational framework towards a solution.

33. Despite the overwhelming concurrence of Member States, and of the PLO itself, with this approach, the diligent efforts of the Secretary-General to make progress towards convening the peace conference have run up against what has always been an insurmountable obstacle to a negotiated settlement—namely, Israel's obstinate refusal to respond positively to any proposal for peace. We have noted with sincere regret that the United States has also responded negatively to this proposal, and we should like to join others in appealing for a reconsideration of its position, for it has been clear all along that the active participation and support of both super-Powers is essential if this process is to have any chance of success.

34. At every instance when the United Nations has sought to embark on a fresh initiative to establish a structure for comprehensive negotiations, Israel has consistently frustrated those efforts by persisting in its policies of terror and oppression of the Palestinian Arabs in the occupied territories and of aggressive expansionism against its neighbours. Time and again, Israel has consciously chosen belligerency over diplomacy and stubborn reliance on policies of force over efforts for peace.

35. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, in its report [*A/39/35*], has graphically detailed these Israeli policies and practices of blatant aggression and repression, as well as Israel's systematic attempts to destroy the PLO politically and physically, in the vain hope of extinguishing the fire of Palestinian nationalism and obliterating Palestinian national identity.

36. Without going into further detail, my delegation would only wish to highlight the fact that in the occupied territories Israel has stepped up its illegal settlements policy, which by its own admission is aimed at achieving 100,000 Israeli settlers by 1987 and a projected figure of 190,000 by the year 2010. In pursuit of this objective, the Tel Aviv régime has intensified its ruthless measures to render life unbearable for the Palestinian Arabs, with the sole intention of eventually forcing them out of their

ancestral homeland. More recently, the Palestinians in the occupied territories have been subjected to attacks by gangs of armed Israeli settlers who enjoy the tacit encouragement, and even the connivance, of the occupation régime. Israel's appalling record of brutality against the indigenous Palestinians is clearly directed towards nothing less than the permanent denial of their national rights, thus exposing also its goal of ultimately annexing the occupied territories.

Mr. Adjoyi (Togo), Vice-President, took the Chair.

37. Israel's contemptuous rejection of all peace initiatives is further reflected in its unceasing hostility towards the United Nations itself, which, ironically, is the very Organization that gave birth to that State. In fact, Israel has gone so far as to blame the United Nations, accusing it of fanning the flames of the conflict by adopting "unbalanced resolutions". However, the incontestable truth is that the United Nations response to Israel's aggression and its violations of the human and national rights of the Palestinians can in no way be considered biased, as all relevant United Nations resolutions scrupulously and consistently defend international norms and principles.

38. Therefore, the reason why today Israel is regarded as a renegade State is to be found in its own actions and policies, not in any decisions taken by the United Nations. It is isolated because its attitudes and policies are anathema to the eyes of the world community, for it has rejected virtually every cardinal principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

39. Israel has sought to portray its aggressive and annexationist policies as somehow conforming to the dictates of national security and self-defence. The death and destruction wrought upon the Palestinian and Arab peoples throughout the long and savage years of Israeli aggression, oppression and foreign occupation, however, have opened the eyes of most of Israel's ardent supporters to the utter falsity of that claim.

40. In contrast to Israel, which is in a position of isolation, the PLO today enjoys the recognition and support of the international community, which has closed ranks with it in the efforts to ensure the realization of the Palestinian people's inalienable right to a sovereign State of its own. The PLO has earned this respect and admiration because few other national liberation movements have so heroically withstood for so many years the merciless onslaught of their enemy. Moreover, its strength and viability were reaffirmed most recently by the successful outcome of the Palestine National Council meeting held last month at Amman. Thus, it is beyond question that the PLO has a legitimate and indispensable role to play as an equal party in all efforts and any negotiations leading to an enduring peace in the Middle East.

41. My delegation has consistently supported the call for a peace conference, as was reflected most recently in our statement on the situation in the Middle East [*75th meeting*], when we affirmed our full backing for the Secretary-General's continuing efforts to bring about the convening of the conference. We agree with him that the United Nations is duty-bound to persevere in trying to devise, within the overall context of the international peace conference, a negotiating process or structure acceptable to all concerned.

42. Indonesia is convinced that at the present stage the peace conference proposal offers the only promising avenue to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace: comprehensive in the sense of simultaneously resolving all the interrelated aspects of the Middle East conflict, with the question of Palestine and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Arab lands as its essential elements; just, by ensuring respect for the rights and security requirements of all parties to the conflict, in accordance with the tenets of international law, morality and human dignity; and lasting, by eliminating the major elements of tension in the region by removing their root causes.

43. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): For 40 years, the Middle East has been one of the most dangerous hotbeds of international tension, and the situation has not improved in recent years. On the contrary, it has deteriorated further owing to the increasingly aggressive nature of Israeli policy and brutal imperialist interference in the internal affairs of States of the region.

44. It is generally considered that the question of Palestine always has been and continues to be at the core of the Middle East problem.

45. We deeply regret that yet another year has been added to the 37 years of the tragic history of the Palestinian people without any real progress having been made in efforts to settle the question of Palestine. Today, the tragedy of the Palestinians is eloquent proof that the imperialist policy of expansion and aggression brings only misfortune to peoples. It is as a result of that policy that an entire people, a people with a long history and a rich culture, has been deprived of its right to a homeland and condemned to live in exile.

46. In the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, the Israeli aggressor has consistently applied a policy of cruel terror, massive repression, national oppression and genocide. These territories have been the target of mass colonization of unprecedented magnitude. New military settlements are constantly created, and existing ones are expanded and consolidated.

47. Those in the Tel Aviv ruling circles not only do not hide their aggressive intentions regarding the occupied territories, but declare them as openly as possible. To illustrate their plans in this regard, suffice it to cite the study on Israel's policy in the West Bank, prepared by a commission presided over by a former mayor of Jerusalem and published in *The New York Times* of 25 April 1984, which concluded that the annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was only a matter of time.

48. This policy of rampant aggression, whose guiding principle is amorality and expansion through brute force, is absolutely contrary to the principles of contemporary international law and to the relevant decisions of the United Nations. In spite of the expressed will of the international community, Tel Aviv persists in this adventurist policy, the most recent example of which is the barbaric invasion of Lebanon.

49. The memory of the monstrous crime perpetrated against the Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila camps will live for ever in the memory of the world community. The mass extermination of the peaceful inhabitants of those two refugee camps—an example *par excellence* of genocide—has been

equalled only by the crimes of the Hitlerite Fascists during the Second World War.

50. The results of Israel's large-scale aggression in Lebanon, now in its third year, are well known: more than 20,000 Lebanese and Palestinians dead and more than 30,000 wounded; one third of the territory of Lebanon still under Israeli control; immense material losses suffered by Lebanon. On Lebanese soil, Israeli militarism applies on a wide scale the sinister experience it gained in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights.

51. The brutality of Israel's policy and the active assistance given it by Washington have not been sufficient to enable it to attain its major objective: the destruction of the Palestinian movement of national liberation, the removal of the question of Palestine from the agenda of the United Nations and of other international forums, and the eradication of the question from the spirit and conscience of mankind.

52. The tragic events of the last few years have demonstrated more clearly than ever before that there is no force capable of stifling the aspiration of the Palestinian people to freedom and independence. Its determined struggle to achieve its inalienable national rights daily increases the sympathy and respect of the peoples of the whole world.

53. The huge international consensus on the principles and the sole means of justly resolving the question of Palestine has been expressed in numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during the last 15 years. Among them is the important resolution 38/58 C, in which the Assembly endorsed the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[3] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, and reaffirmed the proposal to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East. That consensus was also supported in the Final Declaration of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982;[4] in the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983;[5] and in the Political Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, issued at Prague on 5 January 1983.[6]

54. Against this backdrop, it is natural to wonder why the question of Palestine still remains unresolved, given the clearly expressed will of the international community.

55. It is as clear as daylight that Israel would never have been able to carry out its brazen policy in the Middle East without the unreserved and total assistance given by its "strategic ally", if the United States did not systematically use its right of veto in the Security Council to block any possibility of equitably resolving the question of Palestine and of applying effective measures against the aggressor. United States assistance to Israel within the context of that well-known "strategic alliance" is based not on moral considerations but on the objectives of military policy. The development of events in the Middle East has revealed the true nature of the separate agreements announced by their authors, with much fanfare, as a "road to peace". Immediately after the signing of the Camp David agreements, there were far more casualties than during the Israeli aggression of 1967, the situation in the region became even more explosive and the danger to international peace even more serious.

56. Thus the great majority of States Members of the United Nations, as well as the Palestine National Council, are right to declare that they are against the attempts to revive the American "plans" for a settlement of the problem of the Middle East that do not take into account the legitimate interests of all the peoples of the region.

57. Experience has shown that peace and stability in the Middle East can be assured only through collective efforts and with the participation of all the parties involved, including the PLO, not through separate agreements and dubious missions of good offices.

58. The People's Republic of Bulgaria has more than once stated that it favours a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East. An integral part of such a solution is the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish its own state on the soil of Palestine and under the leadership of the PLO.

59. While reaffirming its full solidarity with the heroic Arab people of Palestine, the People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to give its active support to the just struggle which that people is waging against aggression and national oppression, the final objective of which is the enjoyment of its legitimate right to live in its own independent, sovereign Palestinian State, in peace and co-operation with all peoples of the region.

60. The People's Republic of Bulgaria firmly believes in the just cause of the Palestinian people and in the triumph of that cause.

61. Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros) (*interpretation from French*): The Israeli-Palestinian conflict constitutes the major source of tension in the world, and the failure to settle this problem constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security, just as it frustrates the various measures that have been adopted by the United Nations to preserve peace in the world.

62. The Palestinian question emerged from the conflict between zionism and the Arab people of Palestine, but it also constitutes the axis of the Arab-Israeli conflict—in short, the key to the crisis in the Middle East.

63. The essence of this problem is the fact that, since 1948, a people driven from its land and dispersed throughout several countries has been struggling to exercise its fundamental rights and establish its own State in accordance with the right of peoples to self-determination.

64. The fate of the Palestinian people arouses feelings of profound sympathy and fraternal support from other peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America in particular. No one today can contest the justice of the Palestinian claim; no one can deny the legality of that claim under international law.

65. The Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, since its arrival on the international scene, has never failed to proclaim loudly and clearly the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to establish an independent and sovereign State on the Arab soil of Palestine, which has been occupied arbitrarily by Israel.

66. For very nearly 40 years, the United Nations has endeavoured, as set forth in Article 1 of the Charter:

> "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, . . . "

67. All these efforts of the United Nations to ensure that the spirit and the letter of that Article are respected unfortunately come up against the intransigence of the Zionist State. We are therefore entitled to ask how the United Nations can be the craftsman of peace if Member States do not abide by its Charter.

68. The Israeli State, warmongering and expansionist by nature, is continuing to defy the international community and flagrantly violate the various resolutions that have been adopted by the United Nations to promote friendly relations among peoples. The continuance of the illegal occupation of Arab territories of Palestine, their militarization and the barbarous massacres carried out against the Palestinian people, as well as the base acts of destabilization against the Arab people of the region, are but further obstacles that lessen the chances of success of United Nations efforts to establish peace in that part of the world.

69. My country admires the dynamism with which the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People is discharging its heavy and complex mission. My delegation would like to avail itself of this opportunity to extend its deep gratitude to the Committee and in particular to its Chairman, Mr. Massamba Sarré, for their tireless efforts on behalf of the Palestinian people. I should like to pay a tribute to this people for its courage and firm determination to regain its ancestral land that has been unjustly occupied by the force of arms.

70. Despite the various trials used to pit Palestinian against Palestinian, despite indiscriminate massacres and physical liquidation, the Palestinian people remains devoted to its national unity.

71. My country appreciates the role that is played by the PLO, the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people, to preserve the national unity of this people that has been dispersed in various countries.

72. Last month's gathering at Amman of the Palestine National Council constitutes the best example of this unity. My country is most gratified with this success, which will be able to dash divisionist speculations.

73. The Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros is proud of the heroic struggle that is courageously being waged by the Palestinian people. That is why my delegation would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its unswerving support for their just cause.

74. We would like urgently to appeal to all the fraternal Arab countries to stand behind the PLO, the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. Any attempt to divide that historic movement does nothing other than redound to the benefit of the Zionist enemy.

75. Mr. KURODA (Japan): The situation in the Middle East continues to be volatile and is a source of concern to countries of the world. In particular, there is still no sign of a solution to the question of Palestine, which is the core of the Middle East problem. The bloodshed and suffering in the Middle East will continue until a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine is found. Regrettably, efforts towards a solution have not been fruitful. Indeed, the plight of the Palestinian people has recently become even worse.

76. Since I already stated the position of the Government of Japan on the question of Palestine in the debate on the situation in the Middle East, on 27 November [*75th meeting*], I will not repeat it here. I wish at this time simply to say that Japan has consistently maintained that, in order to solve the question of Palestine, it is essential that Israel and the PLO recognize each other's position and that the PLO participate in the peace process.

77. We hope that, in order to realize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of self-determination, the unity of the PLO will be restored and that it will consolidate its position as an integral party in the search for peace. In this connection, we intend to follow what course the PLO will take subsequent to the recent meeting of the Palestine National Council.

78. Moreover, Japan believes it is of utmost importance that both Israel and the Palestinian people make every effort to dispel mutual distrust and foster a will to coexist. From this point of view, too, Japan cannot condone Israel's policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories, nor Israel's measures unilaterally to change the status of the occupied Arab territories, such as the annexation of East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. At the same time, Japan strongly appeals to Israel, as the occupying authority, to make special efforts to protect the human rights of the Palestinian inhabitants of those territories in accordance with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[1]

79. At present, the peace process is at a stalemate. The Government of Japan strongly hopes that the parties concerned will carefully consider past international efforts, such as President Reagan's initiative of 1 September 1982,[7] and the Final Declaration of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982,[4] and, with a realistic, constructive and flexible attitude, will make serious efforts towards the achievement of genuine peace in the region.

80. There is, of course, no easy solution to the Middle East problems, but the Government of Japan reaffirms its intention to co-operate with all efforts towards the early attainment of our common goal—a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, achieved through a process of negotiation and without recourse to the use of force.

81. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the heart of the struggle between the Arabs and Israel, which enters its fourth decade in the region of the Middle East, lies the question of Palestine, that of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, in the refugee camps, in exile or in the diaspora.

82. A sound historic approach to the question of Palestine shows that it is no longer acceptable or logical continually to scorn the right to independence and existence of the Palestinians as a people which wants respect for its legitimate rights, foremost among which is its right to self-determination.

83. The Palestinian nation, which is a distinct and strong entity, has a national consciousness around which its people rallies. It therefore wishes to be recognized and not scorned, to be taken into account and not ignored. On this basis, Egypt appreciates the importance of the session of the Palestinian National Council at Amman from 22 to 29 November 1984, which confirmed the independent nature of the Palestinian decision and the freedom of the Palestinian will. Herein, Egypt finds a conscious choice with regard to a just peace and an enhancement of the legitimacy of the Palestinian people and the victory of Palestinian rights and interests.

84. The objective, comprehensive and democratic dialogue between the Palestinian people and its legitimate leadership in the PLO, as well as its struggling contingents, reaffirms the vitality of that people, its unity of purpose and its unflagging determination to continue the struggle for the exercise of its national and legitimate right to return and to self-determination.

85. There is no perspective more significant or more profound than the comprehensive perspective based on principle from which Egypt views the unity of the Palestinian people and their continuing struggle within the framework of the unity, cohesion and solidarity of the one Arab nation.

86. This was manifested in the meeting of the Palestine National Council at Amman. It was explicit in President Mubarak's statement before the Egyptian Parliament on 2 December 1984, when he welcomed the Jordanian monarch, King Hussein, during his visit to Egypt. President Mubarak stated:

> "The events unfolding around us make it necessary for me to dot the i's and cross the t's. I listen to the one Arab voice, the voice of one Arab nation, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf, calling on all Arab leaders to turn to the new page on which our future history is written. This is our historic responsibility towards the coming generations.
>
> "Accordingly, we greeted the Palestine National Council, which met in the capital of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. That meeting is an indication of the Arab capacity to overcome artificial barriers and of the fact that the will to unity and solidarity is far stronger than division and dissension."

The Egyptian President added:

> "Egypt will never abandon its vanguard role in the service of Arab causes and will never falter in carrying out its duty, however violent the storms and waves. It is a firm strategy of Egypt's policy to champion the Palestinian cause."

87. Day after day in the occupied Arab territories there are numerous examples of colonization, *de facto* annexation, coercion, duress, the seizure of lands, expropriation of property, unjust exploitation of resources and continuing arbitrary practices, the most abhorrent of which is the imposition of a dual legal system that discriminates between the Palestinian inhabitants, who are the rightful owners of the land, and the Israeli settlers. All this has led to a vicious circle of occupation, followed by resistance, then oppression and then yet more resistance. Occupation has led to what we see today in the way of obnoxious fanaticism and organized terrorism perpetrated by intruding settler groups.

88. In spite of all these material conditions which have been imposed, and in spite of arbitrary practices, an enlightened reading of all these events shows that power, domination, the bonds of military occupation and structural or demographic changes can never quell the desire for national existence of an authentic people which has lived hundreds—nay, thousands—of years on its land in Palestine. This is not the position of the international community alone, but is indeed the voice of reason among peoples that cherish peace and justice, a voice now beginning to echo within Israel itself.

89. Israeli policies in the occupied Arab territories stem from a false assumption and therefore lead to the wrong results. Israel's non-recognition of the applicability of the Geneva conventions to the occupied Arab territories and its non-compliance with its responsibilities as a signatory to those conventions in its capacity as an occupying authority can never impart legitimacy or legality to any measures—recent or old—emanating from those arbitrary policies, based on *faits accomplis*.

90. The establishment of new illegal settlements and the expansion of existing ones are illegal. The original settlements and the proliferation of settlements are also illegal.

91. Above all, the annexation by the Government of Israel in 1980 of the City of Jerusalem is an illegal act. This legal and political position was reaffirmed by the Security Council in resolution 478 (1980).

92. It is incumbent upon the international community to take deterrent measures to prevent the loss of the Holy City of Jerusalem through the action of Israeli forces within the framework of Israeli sovereignty over and occupation of the Arab territories.

93. The international community is called upon to take the necessary measures to preserve the security of the Holy City, which is a source of inspiration for all those who believe in divine revelation and is a place of fraternity and tolerance, and to prevent Israel from imposing its will unilaterally on a historic, unique city which the whole world regards as special.

94. Egypt's position of principle is unswerving: it rejects Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem. Egypt insists that Jerusalem is part of the occupied Arab territories and subject to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, as well as to the Geneva conventions. No change in its demographic, geographic or administrative nature can be regarded as legal or in any way serve as a precedent.

95. The Holy City of Jerusalem must remain Arab and must be protected from all regional conflict and from Israeli domination. It must remain a city of peace and love, as ordained by God and the prophets.

96. In his statement before the General Assembly on 28 September last [*12th meeting*], the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs made a general evaluation of the different elements of the Palestinian question, its causes and dimensions and the elements of a just and comprehensive solution.

97. That statement included a number of considerations that are indispensable in arriving at a just political settlement of the question of Palestine. These can be summed up as follows.

98. First, peace and expansion into the land of others are irreconcilable. Israel must therefore relinquish the occupied Arab territories so that genuine peace can be attained. This applies equally to the

West Bank, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, to the Gaza Strip and, of course, to the occupied Syrian Golan Heights.

99. Secondly, the question of Palestine must be resolved through negotiations, with the participation of the Palestinian people, the party directly concerned, and Israel.

100. Thirdly, these negotiations must be based on the principle of mutual and reciprocal recognition of the right of the other to exist.

101. Fourthly, the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination is a sacred, inalienable right and necessarily entails its right to establish an independent State on its national soil and, if it so wishes, to choose unity with any other entity through the free expression of its will.

102. Fifthly, the Palestinian people, as the party directly concerned, has the right to choose its representatives and spokesmen. The Palestinian people has already chosen the PLO as its representative and spokesman.

103. Egypt, which honours its commitments and its signature to treaties and conventions, foremost among which is the Charter of the United Nations, which calls for the peaceful settlement of disputes, has chosen the path of peace. Egypt is following that path in the firm conviction that peace must be based on justice and that only such a peace can satisfy the interests of all concerned. The arduous road that leads to peace and progress must proceed through free negotiations, based on the principle of mutual recognition of rights and respect for mutual commitments. This is the challenge we must all meet.

104. Egypt, which has expressed its readiness to explore all possible avenues, in President Mubarak's message on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, commemorated on 29 November 1984, reaffirmed that it favoured

> "all constructive initiatives, including that of the United Nations, for the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation, on an equal footing, of all concerned parties, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, so as to translate the aspirations for peace and coexistence into an historic reconciliation guaranteeing rights and based on law".

105. The recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*see A/39/35, annex I*], endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, in 1976, continue to serve as an acceptable basis. There is no doubt that the efforts of the Committee and its members have advanced those recommendations towards more developed and more effective horizons through the documents of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in the summer of 1983.

106. In this context, we wish to pay a tribute to the efforts of the Committee and its Chairman. We appreciate their contribution and lend our support to their efforts.

107. Egypt, with responsibility and effectiveness, participated in the preparation for that historic conference and, together with all the participating countries, worked for its success. We feel that the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[3] unanimously approved by the Conference, constitutes a balanced, constructive and realistic framework for opening the peace process, based on justice, to new horizons. Egypt believes that the implementation of the multifaceted Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[3] adopted by the Conference, constitutes a continuous and renewable framework that would enable the Palestinian people to recover their inalienable and legitimate rights.

108. The recommendations of the Committee this year [*ibid., paras. 155-160*], have highlighted the great importance attached to the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East, called for last year by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C and described in the Committee's recommendations as providing an opportunity for all the concerned parties to participate in the negotiations leading to a just settlement of the question of Palestine.

109. In this connection, we wish to recall again the relevant observations made by the Secretary-General in his report on the situation in the Middle East [*A/39/600*] and refer to his precise analysis of the need to move in this direction in the search for a peaceful settlement, especially with regard to the cardinal role attributed to the Security Council as the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as to his practical views on the basis of negotiation, its context and the role that the Secretary-General himself can play in consultation with the Council and the concerned parties in preparation for such a conference.

110. Discussion of the question of Palestine began with the establishment of the United Nations. The passage of four decades since the beginning of the conflict should not make us forget for one moment its true causes and origin. Nor must we forget the fate met by the resolutions adopted year after year by the United Nations.

111. The time elapsed after the adoption of a United Nations resolution does not rob it of its legitimacy or legality, in spite of Israel's disregard of United Nations resolutions, or violation of them.

112. The rights of the Palestinian people are deep-rooted in their land. The Palestinian people's right to return and to self-determination is authentic, however long that may take. No matter how long Israel continues to violate international conventions, the political, legal and historic bases of the national and legitimate rights of the Palestinian people in their land cannot be denied.

113. In the final analysis, the Palestine cause remains the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It will symbolize the human reality which the voice of reason beckons us to acknowledge and not deny. It calls on us to deal with it, not to ignore it, for the Palestinian people, like all other peoples in the region, are entitled to a secure existence and a free and dignified life.

114. Palestine will always remain a source of peace—if that is indeed the will of the peoples of the region—or it can continue to be a theatre of slaughter, agony and loss of life, if one party to the conflict continues to be the prisoner of historic illusions and the victim of a desire for domination and supremacy over the other parties.

115. The choice in Palestine is between peace and strife. Wisdom and realism call on us to look to the future, to opt for peace and to exploit all the opportunities that are before us all. We must choose

peace, a peace based on justice—the only kind of peace that can result in the security and stability to which we all aspire.

116. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Post-war history has seen quite a few examples of the emergence and fanning of regional conflicts for which imperialist and other reactionary forces are to blame. These are conflicts which threaten international peace and security. But probably the most acute and protracted of them is still the conflict in the Middle East, of which a key element is the Palestinian problem.

117. The core of this problem, as is well known, is the fact that the Arab people of Palestine is deprived of its inalienable right to self-determination and the establishment of its own State. Despite numerous United Nations resolutions and efforts of the international community, the past year has not alleviated the plight of the long-suffering Palestinian people. This is attested to by many facts cited in the discussion and in reports from the occupied territories.

118. The present explosive situation in the Middle East region is the result of the adventuristic, expansionist policy of Israel, encouraged and supported by the United States. It is the ruling circles of Israel which are carrying out an inflexible chauvinistic policy towards the Arab people of Palestine, egging on the country to continue the occupation of Palestinian and other Arab lands, implementing a deliberate policy of expelling the Palestinian people from the lands they have seized and trying by force of arms to put an end to the Palestinian question.

119. At present, Tel Aviv has behind the bars of the occupation régime about 2 million persons, that is, a population equal to about half the inhabitants of Israel. Numerous events attest to the fact that the Israeli clique is carrying out a policy of mass terrorism in the occupied territories. Murder of the civilian population, mass acts of repression and torture, collective reprisals, medical experiments on prisoners, destruction of housing and expulsion of persons—those are ingredients of the Zionist "iron-fist" policy, the major objective of which is to gain for Israel more "vital space."

120. It is accompanied by stepped-up colonization of the Arab lands seized as a result of aggression and is aimed at changing the demographic picture. According to several sources, as a result of expropriation, Israel now controls 60 per cent of Palestinian lands. The establishment of Israeli settlements on these lands is going on at an ever faster pace. The number of such settlements is already about 200. In the next 30 years, the number of colonists in them will exceed a million, given the present level of 50,000. Such are the results of the plans and the policies of "creeping annexation" regarding the occupied territories. These actions are a crude violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] and they have been condemned on numerous occasions by the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies.

121. The question naturally arises as to how Israel, which received its own statehood as a result of United Nations decisions, has been able for so many years blatantly to ignore decisions of the Organization, openly trample underfoot all norms of international law and the provisions of the Charter, continue to occupy Palestinian lands and cynically deny the legitimate owners their inalienable rights.

122. There is one answer to this: Israel could not behave in such a brazen and provocative manner were it not for the patronage and comprehensive support it receives from its overseas partner in "a strategic alliance". By arming and watching over the aggressor, defending it in the United Nations, the United States, together with Israel, bears direct responsibility for the dangerous situation existing in the Middle East which threatens international peace, and they bear the responsibility for the fact that the Palestinian problem has not yet been resolved. As has been rightly noted in the course of the current Assembly session, it is precisely those two States which are now blocking the way to genuine peace in the Middle East, peremptorily trying to impose on the Arabs separate deals which are in contradiction with the true interests of the Arab countries and ignore the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

123. It is well known that only thanks to generous financial injections from overseas can Israel continue its expansionist policy against the Arab peoples. This year alone, financial assistance to Israel accounted for $2.61 billion, and the needs of the aggressor grow unchecked. Thus, for the new financial year, Tel Aviv, it is reported, is planning to request $5 billion. There can be no doubt that Washington will turn a sympathetic ear to this request. In this connection *The Christian Science Monitor* of 6 September this year noted that: "The pro-Israeli lobby has shown on many occasions that it can win out over the Administration, both in Congress and in the Senate, on any question which affects the interests of Israel".

124. The pro-Israeli policy of the United States has once again been reaffirmed in discussion in the Security Council this year of incidents of the lawlessness of the Israeli military clique against the Lebanese and Palestinians in occupied southern Lebanon.

125. The anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian essence of the policy of strategic partners was also reaffirmed by their negative attitude towards the idea of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East. It is because of the obstructionist policies of those two Governments that General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, regarding the convening of such a conference, has still not been implemented. From 1976 onwards, because of the United States veto, implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has not been carried out. Those recommendations lay down ways and means of implementing those rights. Using trumped-up excuses, they also reject other constructive proposals, including the Arab peace plan, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[4] and others aimed at solving the Middle East problem and finding a just solution to the Palestinian problem.

126. The Ukrainian SSR is convinced that it is not through military adventures or backstage intrigues and separate deals that peace can be brought to the peoples of the Middle East. A fundamental improvement in the situation in the Middle East can be achieved only through joint efforts, through conven-

ing an international conference with the participation of all parties involved, including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine. It is precisely that course which is indicated in the 29 July 1984 proposals of the Soviet Union [*see A/39/368*] on the settlement of the Middle East problem. They provide for a full withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territories occupied in 1967, a just solution to the key problem of a settlement for the Middle East and for the Palestine problem on the basis of the implementation of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, *inter alia*, its right to self-determination and to the creation of its own independent State. The Soviet proposals give both an overview and a summary of the initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union at various stages of the development of this conflict and lay down clear principles and concrete means for eliminating the problem. Those proposals, which take into account the legitimate interests of all countries and peoples of the region, received broad approval in the Arab world and also a positive assessment during the course of the current session of the General Assembly. All those who genuinely aspire to a peaceful settlement of the problem of the Middle East supported them.

127. In stating our solidarity with the just struggle of the Palestinian people for their inalienable rights, we call for a closing of ranks among anti-imperialist national patriotic forces of the Arab countries, including the Palestine resistance movement. This is an earnest of the success of the struggle of the Arabs against imperialism and zionism and for the establishment of a just, lasting peace in the Middle East and ensuring the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

128. The Ukrainian SSR favours the adoption by the General Assembly of effective measures aimed at the speedy solution of the problem of the Middle East. Such a solution is awaited by all peoples of the region, and first and foremost by the Palestinian people.

129. We believe the General Assembly should take an unequivocal stand favouring the continuation of efforts for the speedy convening of an international conference on the Middle East. The obstacles raised to so doing must be eliminated. In this connection, we call on the Assembly to adopt an appropriate decision, and we are ready actively to support it.

130. Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The fact that the question of Palestine, the core of the conflict in the Middle East, remains without a just solution has serious consequences for stability in the region. This question, which continues to be given priority attention by the United Nations, requires serious measures to find a just solution, especially since the absence of a solution to the problem only adds to the sufferings of the Palestinian people, who have been forcibly expelled from their land and are subjected to the most horrendous forms of terrorism and torture and whose lands and properties have been expropriated by the Israeli occupying authorities.

131. The successive events and developments in the Middle East amply demonstrate that without a withdrawal by Israel from the Arab territories it occupies and without a just solution of the question of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return to its country, the right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent State on its national soil, the explosive situation in the Middle East will be exacerbated.

132. The continuation of these aggressive, racist and expansionist policies of Israel in the Palestinian territories and the occupied Arab territories—occupation, annexation, expropriation, the expansion and establishment of settlements, oppression, terrorism and deportation of the Palestinian people, according to an overall framework of Zionist schemes and goals—is only making the Palestinian and Arab peoples more than ever determined to cling to their ancestral lands and to continue their struggle for liberation, knowing that they enjoy the support and solidarity of all forces and countries in the world that cherish peace and freedom.

133. The only path to peace and security in the Middle East is that of a comprehensive, just and lasting solution, one that does not fragment the question or disregard the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. The policy of separate, bilateral agreements which the United States and Israel are trying to impose on the peoples of the region is contrary to the legitimate interests of the Arab people and constitutes partiality and support on the part of the United States for Israel's policy of aggression and expansion in the region.

134. I would like to emphasize once again my country's firm position. It supports the struggle of the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, against aggressive policies and conspiracies designed to impose final solutions that are contrary to United Nations resolutions and to the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people.

135. At the same time, we express our appreciation for the international efforts and initiatives designed to restore a just and lasting peace to the Middle East and to defuse the explosive situation, through the holding of an international conference with the participation of all the parties concerned in the conflict, including the PLO.

136. The Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[3] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, emphasized that a just solution of the question of Palestine is the crucial element in a political, just, lasting and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. That declaration also lays down the guidelines for such a settlement. They include the right of the Palestinian people to return to its land, its right to self-determination and its right to establish its own independent State in its homeland. The Geneva Declaration also calls for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, with a view to the achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, based, above all, on the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in Palestine. The declaration provides that the conference should be held with the participation, on an equal footing, of all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO, the United States, the Soviet Union and other concerned States.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

137. Furthermore, the Soviet Union recently put forward some proposals [*ibid.*] regarding the question of Palestine and the Middle East. Those proposals are essentially in line with the General Assembly's

call for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East.

138. In our view, these international proposals and initiatives provide a viable, practical and realistic framework for the realization of a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, under which the Palestinian people could exercise their inalienable national rights and the occupied Arab territories, including Arab Jerusalem, could be liberated. Democratic Yemen calls on the international community to take practical steps to achieve a just and lasting settlement in the region.

139. Moreover, in our opinion, the rejection by Israel and its strategic ally, the United States, of these initiatives and their continued denial to the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights emphasize the fact that this strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, which has been condemned by the General Assembly, only exacerbates tension in the Middle East and turns the region into an arena for conspiracies against the peoples of the Arab countries, thereby endangering peace and stability in the region. The aim is to pave the way for imposing imperialist hegemony on the Arab lands, plundering the wealth of the Arab States and taking control over their destiny.

140. The true American-Zionist intentions and objectives in the region are very clear; they cannot be hidden. Unlimited support by the United States for Israel, in all fields, is the principal factor behind Israel's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions and its continued defiance of the international community's will. As is known, the United States continues to support Israel in the United Nations by using its veto power in the Security Council. The United States even resorts to threatening States and international organizations that condemn Israeli policies and practices. That demonstrates the complete bias of the United States in favour of Israel.

141. We hope that the discussions at the current session will provide new impetus for international solidarity with the just cause of the Palestinian people and its legitimate struggle. We also hope that it will bolster the Assembly's condemnation of the aggressive, expansionist and racist policies pursued by Israel, with the support and encouragement of the United States. In that way, the United Nations will shoulder its full responsibility to eliminate the injustice and suffering to which the Palestinian people is subjected and will be able to take practical steps to achieve a just and lasting settlement so that peace may reign in that explosive region and the Palestinian people may be enabled to exercise its inalienable national rights.

142. Mr. Shah NAWAZ (Pakistan): The consideration of the question of Palestine is yet another sombre reminder, if any is needed, that the international community has not been able to resolve what is perhaps the oldest issue on the General Assembly's agenda. The question of Palestine has been figuring in our debates for nearly four decades and we are no nearer a solution of the problem today than we were 37 years ago, when the issue first came up for the consideration of the General Assembly.

143. Year after year, the General Assembly in its deliberations on the Palestinian question has focused its attention on the two distinguishable, though inseparable, aspects of the problem—namely, the plight of the Palestinians in the occupied territories, and the reaffirmation and realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national independence, which is at the heart of the Middle East conflict. On both counts, the picture remains dismal.

144. All over the world, people are vividly conscious of the cruel fate which has overtaken the Palestinian people, under alien occupation in the land of their birth and as refugees scattered in foreign lands. This tragedy is of such enormous proportions that familiarity with it does not blunt the edge of our sensitivity or render us immune to suffering the pangs of conscience which it generates.

145. In the West Bank and in Gaza, the indomitable people of Palestine face a relentless oppressor which is pursuing a calculated policy of harassment and terrorism aimed at compelling them to abandon the land on which they have lived for over a millennium and where they have built a vibrant nation and a proud civilization. Outside the land of their birth, most of them suffer the indescribable hardships of deprivation and life in exile. Even in the refugee camps they have not found safety from relentless vengeance and ruthlessness, of which the brutal massacres in the Sabra and Shatila camps in Lebanon following the Israeli onslaught against that country in 1982 were the most savage expressions.

146. We wish to convey our deep appreciation to Mr. Massamba Sarré, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, for the report of the Committee [*A/39/35*], which reviews in detail the appalling conditions of the Palestinians living under Israeli occupation. The report gives numerous instances of harassment and persecution of the Arab and Palestinian population in the occupied territories, which are kept constantly terrorized through frequent curfews and the routine practice of security checks by the Israeli occupation authorities—soldiers, police and settlers—at any time of the day or night. At the same time, the economy of the occupied territories is being manipulated in a manner which facilitates control over production and reduction of the capacity to create employment. Consequently, young Palestinians are forced to leave the land of their fathers in search of employment and sustenance abroad.

147. Terrorism is rampant, and even the Islamic holy places are not immune from desecration at the hands of fanatics who openly advocate the obliteration of Arab and Palestinian existence and the banishment of their cultural heritage from the occupied territories.

148. The most disturbing and sinister aspect of Israeli policy in the occupied territories is the systematic pursuit of the objective of permanent annexation of the occupied territories by altering their Palestinian and Arab character. The main thrust of this policy is towards changing the demographic pattern of the occupied territories through the expropriation of Arab and Palestinian lands and the establishment of Israeli settlements. Measures have been taken to limit or obstruct the expansion or growth of Palestinian towns and villages and to divert the resources of the land, particularly water, for the benefit of Israeli settlers. According to the report of the Committee, the ominous long-term consequences of this policy are evident in the Israeli projections, which envisage settling a minimum of 100,000 Israeli citizens in the occupied territories by

1987 and 190,000 by the year 2010. These numbers exclude Israeli settlers in Jerusalem and other Palestinian localities incorporated into the city immediately after the 1967 war.

149. The report of the Committee also touches upon the conditions in the Palestinian refugee camps in southern Lebanon, which fell under Israeli occupation in 1982. The concern, reflected in the report, over the security of the Palestinian refugee camps, particularly at Ein el-Hilweh, was the subject of Security Council deliberations in May of this year. It is a matter of deep regret that the Council was unable to respond to the Lebanese complaint about the coercive practices and measures enforced by the Israeli occupation authorities against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, which includes a large segment of Palestinian refugees who, like their compatriots in the West Bank and Gaza, have become the victims of Israeli intolerance.

150. The continuously deteriorating conditions inside the occupied territories are rendered more poignant by the bleakness of the prospects for a solution of the Palestinian question on the basis of the realization by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights. The numerous international initiatives seeking a just solution to this festering problem have all foundered on the rock of Israeli intransigence.

151. In the wake of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, the Arab leadership, demonstrating exemplary moderation and restraint, announced at Fez on 9 September 1982, at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[4] a plan which was acclaimed throughout the world as offering a reasonable basis for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The Israeli authorities rejected the Fez plan out of hand. They even dismissed President Reagan's initiative of 1 September 1982,[7] leaving little doubt about the existence and pursuit by Israel of a policy of relentless expansion in which the national rights of the Palestinian people have no place.

152. Undeterred by Israeli defiance, the United Nations has persisted in its efforts to ensure the restitution of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Last year, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 36/120 C, the United Nations convened at Geneva, from 29 August to 7 September, the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, with the object of making a comprehensive effort to seek effective ways and means to enable the Palestinian people to regain and exercise their rights. Shortly afterwards, the General Assembly, echoing a decision taken at the Geneva Conference, adopted resolution 38/58 C, recommending the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East, which, if it were to materialize, could provide an opportunity for all parties concerned to participate in negotiations leading to a comprehensive solution of the problem.

153. We are grateful to the Secretary-General for undertaking efforts to promote this General Assembly initiative, which are the subject of a report [*A/39/130 and Add.1*] under this agenda item. Consultations held last February in the Security Council enabled the Secretary-General to pursue the initiative regarding the convening and organization of the conference. It is clear, however, that in the absence of support from the United States and Israel, the initiative on an international conference on the Middle East will be stillborn.

154. The continuing deadlock over these initiatives will benefit no country in the Middle East; nor can it bring any advantage to the two super-Powers, which have long professed their interest in the peace and stability of this sensitive region of the world. The deteriorating political climate in the region, and in particular inside the occupied territories, is a source of intense violence, the impact of which is being felt far beyond the region of the Middle East.

155. The years of deepening conflict in the Middle East and the threat this poses to global peace call for full recognition of the imperatives of peace and security in the region. Foremost among these are the immutable conditions, repeatedly spelt out by the General Assembly, for a Palestinian settlement. These are: the withdrawal by Israel from Palestinian and Arab territories occupied by it since 1967 and respect for the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to establish their own independent State in Palestine. This is not a new demand. The General Assembly mandated the creation of a Palestinian State concomitantly with that of Israel as early as November 1947. Israel cannot hope for peace or enjoy security without meeting these conditions.

156. It must be recognized that a settlement of the Palestinian question cannot conceivably be negotiated without the active participation of the Palestinian people through their authentic representative, the PLO. No process for the determination of the fate and destiny of the people of Palestine can be a viable process without their full participation.

157. It must also be recognized that progress towards a settlement requires the co-operation of both the super-Powers whose interests are so deeply involved in the area. Negotiations excluding one of them from making its indispensable contribution would be sterile. The strong international support available to the Palestinian cause at the United Nations and other international forums needs to be combined with a concerted, determined, yet pragmatic, endeavour by the Palestinian and Arab leadership, with the sole objective of seeking redress for the injustice done to the Palestine people. We are heartened by the success of the recent meeting of the Palestine National Council at Amman which promises the return of solidarity within the PLO, so vital for the advancement of the Palestinian cause. We hope that the decisions taken by the Council will provide a much-needed impetus to international efforts for a just and speedy resolution of the Palestinian question.

158. Meanwhile, the United Nations must pursue its endeavours to provide relief to the Palestinians under Israeli occupation and to prevent violations of their human rights. Simultaneously, it must continue to explore and seize without loss of time the opportunities which exist for a negotiated peace in the Middle East. The United Nations bears a special responsibility for the realization of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. The failure of the international community to fulfil its commitment to the Palestinian people will have incalculable consequences for the United Nations and, indeed, for world peace and security.

159. I take this opportunity to reaffirm the abiding commitment of the Government and the people of

Pakistan to the Palestine cause, a commitment which goes as far back as the beginnings of our own struggle for independence. Pakistan will continue to exert all efforts and extend all support for the deliverance of the people of Palestine from Israeli occupation.

160. Mr. ALAUKLI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): For over 37 years, the General Assembly has discussed the question of Palestine in both regular and extraordinary sessions. Each time, numerous resolutions are adopted reaffirming the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and their right to self-determination and the establishment of their own independent State. Each time also, all who harbour good intentions expect that a miracle will occur and hope that the recurrent call expressing the awakening of world conscience will be heard and that there will be a happy end to the tragedy of the Palestinian people, to their long sufferings and to the sacrifices they have made in their occupied land and in exile. Nevertheless, zionism and successive American administrations do not hesitate to place repeatedly coercive constraints on such hopes.

161. In the face of the separation and contradiction between international decisions and the likelihood of their implementation, we can see how those who, in haste and without difficulty, formulated the Charter of the United Nations in the aftermath of the Second World War, wrote the beautiful and optimistic Preamble to that Charter. It is clear that the founders were not sufficiently aware at the time that imperialist designs are even more dangerous for peace than fascism, that racism did not end with the fall of nazism and that threats to international peace and security persist in the absence of an international will and authority capable of protecting the causes of justice, right, freedom and peace.

162. The question of Palestine, in the past and at present, bears historic witness to the continuing prevalence of unjust rules in international relations, even with a United Nations presence in the matter. It also points to grave defects in the current form of the international Organization. Nearly 40 years after the establishment of the United Nations, equality between States remains for the majority a fantastic dream. In practice, it has been possible for one State, or a small group of States, to challenge the international will and consensus, in total disregard of the principles and provisions of the Charter and the principles of contemporary international law. Power in the world today is confined to the interests of the strong; he who possesses power has tremendous possibilities to transform wrong into right, the impossible into the possible. In such a situation, the legitimate aspirations of lesser peoples are stifled. A barrier is placed before their demands, however strong international sympathy may be. If, employing that logic, they do not offer even greater sacrifices in order to change the balance of power, they will never attain anything. The only other choice available to them is to surrender. That is exactly what zionism and imperialism have striven to impose upon the Palestinian people, and exactly what racism and imperialism wish to impose on the Namibian people. In spite of widespread international sympathy with those two causes, the two racist régimes in Palestine and South Africa continue to challenge the international will.

163. This deplorable fact, which illuminates the deep chasm between the principles and ideals enshrined in the Charter and the prevailing reality governing international relations, does not in any way detract from the value and importance of General Assembly resolutions and decisions to place the Palestinian question on its agenda at every session. In such a way, the General Assembly regularly unmasks the true face of Zionist policy and expresses deep international sympathy with the Palestinian people, at the same time revealing the dimensions of the threat to world peace as a result of the inadequacy of the existing international system and in spite of the lofty ideals of the authors of the Charter of the United Nations.

164. The United Nations bears a great part of the responsibility for the creation and development of the question of Palestine. The General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 [*resolution 181 (II)*], which partitioned Palestine into two States, signalled the first error committed by the United Nations in its history. This could have been due to the good intentions of one party, but the malevolence of the other was quite clear, for this was a step to realize its ambitions in the Arab homeland. Thus, the feelings generated by the set-backs of the Second World War and the memories of Fascist and Nazi injustices were exploited to implant an intruding entity into the Arab world to serve as a custodian for imperialist and colonialist interests in the region and a regional instrument to strike down the possibilities of evolution and unity in the Arab world. Under the slogan of "Justice for the Jews" after their plight in Nazi Germany, the worst case of injustice was inflicted on the Arab and Palestinian peoples. In this regard, the famous English historian Arnold Toynbee said that the Arabs have to pay for a crime they did not commit and the basic responsibility for which falls upon western societies.

165. The question of Palestine is the flagrant embodiment of the start of contemporary Western plots against the Arab nation. It is the bitter harvest reaped after Arab co-operation with Western colonial countries during the two world wars. The question of Palestine represents at the same time a moral crisis facing the Western colonial democracies which ascribe no value to anything save their selfish interests and ambitions. Great Britain, which had responsibility for the Mandate over Arab Palestine, entered into collusion with the world Zionist movement and conspired with it to apply policies aimed at changing the demographic nature of Palestine by forcing the Arab inhabitants to flee by various terrorist means and welcoming thousands of Jews brought over to Palestine by the Jewish Agency. After the conspiracy was revealed, all that remained to be done was to give it international legitimacy. Hence Great Britain referred the whole question to the United Nations, which, under Zionist and imperialist pressure, in November 1947 produced its resolution on the partition of Palestine. Some thought the matter had ended there, but the rejection by the Palestinian people and the Arab nation of this unjust decision, on the one hand, and the escalation of expansionist Zionist ambitions, on the other, has kept the question alive, and it now threatens peace and development not only in the Arab region but also in the rest of the world.

166. The question of Palestine is the responsibility of the United Nations. This fact cannot be changed by the current situation obtaining in this international Organization, the result of the policies of the

super-Powers which, in keeping with their special responsibilities under the Charter, should support freedom and peace. The United Nations has a legal, political and moral responsibility towards the Palestinian people. The United Nations has contributed to the suffering of the Palestinian people, and it must allow them to regain their inalienable rights. Mere denunciations and a disregard of acts of force and of the facts of occupation and oppression will not only affect the credibility and reputation of the United Nations but also will encourage the aggressor to continue its machinations and plans—practices which in time might become difficult to change.

167. The situation in Palestine and the Arab region makes it necessary to reconsider the way the United Nations has dealt with the question during the past four decades, especially since it has become clear that all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the subject, although comprehensive, always lack the possibility of implementation and fall short of deterring the aggressor from pursuing its aggression. This reality calls for a fresh assessment aimed at finding new ways to deal with the problems. I believe this process should be linked to an in-depth study of the problems and their sources, as well as how to resolve them. Here we should refer to a number of important facts directly related to this question.

168. First, the Arab character of Palestine is steeped in history and has never been questioned. The inhabitants of Palestine—be they Muslims, Christians or Jews—are Arabs in origin, culture and civilization. Any allegation to the contrary is an error and does not confer any right to occupy Palestine and to expel its inhabitants, Muslims or Christians. Thus, any attempt to erase the Arab character of Palestine is null and void and cannot be accepted, even though it might produce certain effects lasting years or centuries.

169. Secondly, the Zionist movement, born in the cradle of imperialism and colonialism, is a colonialist and racist political movement, even though it may operate under the guise of religion. Its main features were shaped in that period of historic and social evolution when Europe was imbued with a spirit of adventure and distorted ideas of superiority and supremacy, thus reflecting a culture alien to the Arab region.

170. Thirdly, the Zionist movement is dependent on imperialism and colonialism, which encourage it to expand and give it more and more assistance and support. Hence, at an early stage zionism was the ally of the British and French empires and, later, the ally of American imperialism.

171. Fourthly, the establishment of a religiously segregated community in Arab Palestine, as well as the repercussions of this action, have brought the region to the brink of conflict and instability. Zionist ambitions did not stop with the adoption of the partition plan resolution; zionism has tried to extend the Jewish empire over the largest possible area of Arab territory. The Zionist system does not recognize that its political boundaries are marked by the partition resolution. Zionists believe that that resolution serves as the base and spring-board to implement the successive phases of the Zionist scheme.

172. Fifthly, Zionist plots have always run counter to the objectives of peace and prosperity in the Arab lands. For the Zionist movement, peace consists in imposing its terms on other countries or causing a situation of simple armistice as a prelude to more expansion.

173. These facts, coupled with the reality and nature of the Zionist movement and its links to imperialist, racist and colonial circles, clearly show that it is not a question of conflict over borders but of conflict between the original inhabitant and the intruder. It is not a question of refugees but a question of a people who struggle to regain its usurped rights and of the cause of a nation which struggles against an alien danger which threatens its home, its sacred shrines and its very existence.

174. The Zionist policy—based as it is on power and aggression in its relations with the Arabs, as well as its repressive practices in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories in the form of expulsion, Judaization and the alteration of the demographic, cultural and geographic character of the occupied Arab territories—has unmasked the true nature of the Zionist plan. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has in various respected international documents repeatedly revealed the plight of the Arabs in the occupied territories. The Zionists have not concealed their true intentions. They feel no shame in declaring such ambitions. Rabbi Cook of the Gush Emunim says that this is a period of work and that God will bless such work because He has enjoined all His people to go to Zion and raise the banner over the Holy Land. He says: "Here there is no Arab land; this is our land. The land defined by the Torah extends from the Nile to the Euphrates and it belongs to Israel." Another leader of the Zionist movement, Levinger, clarifies the matter further by saying: "When we deal with the Arabs through force they will surrender to us. If they object to Zionist sovereignty in Judea and Samaria"—he means the West Bank and the Gaza Strip—"we must expel them."

175. Amnon Rubenstein, the former dean of the Faculty of Law of Tel Aviv University, stated, in an article published in *Ha'aretz*, that the Zionist organizations continue to perpetrate their crimes, based on the Kach and Gush Emunim movements, and that: "The Arabs are an inferior race. They have no rights. They constitute a danger to Israel. They must be expelled from the country."

176. In the view of those two organizations, it is necessary to resort to arms to carry out that act of purification.

177. After the success of the terrorist Kahane, the leader of the Kach movement, in the latest Israeli elections, he was asked what his expectations were after five years. He answered, "I expect to be Prime Minister." This should not surprise us, especially when we remember that Menachem Begin, who perpetrated the massacres at Deir Yassin, himself became Prime Minister.

178. These are examples of the thinking and deeds of the Zionist leaders in occupied Arab Palestine. We refer all those who wish to know more to the memoirs of Ben-Gurion, Dayan and others, as well as to the articles published in spring of 1982 by the Zionist Research Institute in Jerusalem about Israeli strategy in the 1980s, which reveal the dimensions of the conspiracy aimed at dividing the Arab countries and imposing Zionist supremacy over them. We refer particularly to the declarations of the terrorist Sharon concerning the vital space of the Zionist entity, which stretches east to Pakistan, west to the Atlantic Ocean,

north to Turkey and south to the Arab peninsula and the heart of the African continent.

179. Speaking about the question of Palestine always leads us to speak about United States policy in the Arab region and the special relationship between the Zionist entity and successive United States Administrations. It is a relationship that found its full dimensions following the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956 and the prominence of the United States as an influential Power in the affairs of the region. The American imperialists seek to maintain their economic and strategic interests and to oppose the trend of political and social change in the Arab world, and this has led them to exploit the Zionist base. The Zionist lobby, whose influence on the United States Congress is well known, has enhanced this relationship to the point where it has become a strategic alliance. That alliance, formalized in November 1983, codified the relations between the two parties in the military, political, economic and financial spheres. On the basis of that alliance, it can be said that the Zionist entity is treated as an American state. The share in American assistance of each Jew in occupied Palestine reached $1,250 in 1984, whereas the American citizen gets only half that figure.

180. President Reagan reaffirms at every opportunity his pride in the special relationship with the Zionist entity. On 6 September, he promised before a Jewish audience in the Sheraton Hotel in Washington to continue to support Israel, especially in the form of campaigns supporting Israel in the United Nations. He added that during the first three years of his Administration, Israel received more than $9.5 billion in aid and would this year receive $2.6 billion in grants.

181. These brief references reveal the nature of the relationship between the Zionists and the United States Government and the fact that, in adopting the Zionist programme, the United States has become a direct partner in the aggression against the Arab nation.

182. The widespread American-Zionist plot against the Arab world places on the United Nations the responsibility of going beyond the usual conciliatory resolutions and adopting practical measures that can lead to a just and lasting peace and put an end to the long suffering of the Palestinian people. Our delegation would like to recall certain facts and principles that should be the basis of efforts aimed at restoring peace and stability in the region. These include the following.

183. First, the question of Palestine and its various ramifications are the result of an organized foreign invasion the motives and objectives of which go beyond economic control to the expulsion of the Arab inhabitants. On this level, the question of Palestine is one of racism and colonialism. It is the responsibility of the international community to liquidate that. Aggressive Zionist racism cannot be reformed or modified, and this applies also to the Pretoria régime.

184. Secondly, in any just settlement of the question two principles of international relations must be fully applied. The first is the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. That principle, which is indivisible, applies to all the Arab and Palestinian territories occupied before and since 1947. The second principle is that the Palestinian people must be enabled to exercise their inalienable right to return, to self-determination and to establish a democratic State on their national soil, a State that would embrace the Arabs of Palestine, be they Muslims, Christians or Jews.

185. Thirdly, any attempt to restore peace to the region must be comprehensive and just and address the various aspects of the question. In this regard, it is important to stress that the United Nations always continues to provide the only appropriate forum for the search for a just and lasting solution of the problem. Consequently, there is no possibility of accepting any partial or even complete arrangements outside the framework of the United Nations, because that would be tantamount to serving Zionist and imperialist schemes for hegemony. The proof of this is the Camp David accords and the Lebanese-Zionist agreement which fell dead under the feet of the heroes of the Lebanese national resistance.

186. Any attempt at settlement that does not take into account the above-mentioned realities and principles will be doomed to failure. The path of justice and equity may be full of obstacles and difficulties, but it is incumbent on the United Nations to assume its heavy responsibility by taking effective and decisive measures to settle a problem that can no longer wait. To be credible, it must do all in its power to put an end to the policies of pillage and aggression by taking the following steps.

187. First, there must be support for the legitimate struggle, including armed struggle, of the Palestinian people for the restoration of its usurped rights.

188. Secondly, the necessary measures must be taken to expel the Zionist entity from the United Nations and to impose mandatory comprehensive sanctions against it, now that the whole world has become aware of the danger which it presents to peace and its constant violation of its commitments under the Charter of the United Nations.

189. Thirdly, pressure must be put on the United States Government to sever its alliance with the Zionist régime and end its assistance to the Zionist entity, which allows the latter to persist in its defiance of the international will and to escalate its policy of aggression.

190. Fourthly, new ways and means must be found to enhance the possibilities of implementing international decisions when the arbitrary use of the veto by the United States prevents the Security Council from fulfilling its function of maintaining peace and security.

191. The question of Palestine did not result from the June 1967 act of aggression against the Arab world, as some believe or wish to believe. That and other acts of aggression that followed were the result of a problem that goes back more than two decades before that date. Therefore, to restrict consideration of this question to the 1967 act of aggression and its consequences is but a perpetuation of injustice and of the destabilization of the Arab region. The people of Palestine count on the United Nations to administer complete justice.

192. In conclusion, on behalf of our delegation, I should like to express to Mr. Massamba Sarré our thanks and our appreciation of the Committee's efforts in heightening the awareness of international public opinion of the reality of zionism and in winning international sympathy for this just international cause.

193. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Many times in this debate and in previous years the General Assembly has heard the historical facts and arguments and reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinians. This year, as well as on the other occasions, the question of Palestine is the core of the issue in the Middle East and holds the key to peace and security in the Middle East as a whole. Therefore, the position of the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand has been consistent and steadfast in support of the rights of the Palestinian people and in the earnest hope of achieving a peaceful and just solution to the problem.

194. Since 1967, Israeli forces have been illegally occupying Arab and Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, which has resulted in countless numbers of displaced, homeless and deprived Palestinians. Various resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly calling for the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and, *inter alia*, reaffirming their right to self-determination and statehood. Any comprehensive, just and durable settlement of the problem must therefore be based on the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

195. However, the situation not only is unchanged but has indeed worsened. My delegation would like therefore to reiterate Thailand's position, as follows.

196. First, Thailand firmly supports all relevant United Nations resolutions on the question of Palestine, particularly resolution 242 (1967). We believe that they constitute the proper foundation for solving the problem peacefully. We also appreciate and support the ongoing effort of the Secretary-General, especially his endeavour to lend his good offices in pursuit of a just and lasting solution.

197. Secondly, Thailand supports unequivocally the aspirations and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, the right to national independence and sovereignty, and the right to return safely to their homes and properties. However, we also believe that, while respecting Palestinian rights as being sacrosanct, the international community must be mindful of the legitimate rights of other States. Hence, while we reaffirm our support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, including the right to statehood, we also respect the legitimate right of all States in the region to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. We earnestly believe that this would contribute to a just and durable settlement of the problem.

198. Thirdly, Thailand views the PLO as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. This was recently reaffirmed in my Prime Minister's message to the special meeting in commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, held here on 29 November 1984. We therefore support the right of the PLO, in conformity with relevant United Nations resolutions, to participate on an equal footing in all negotiations and conferences on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East within and outside the framework of the United Nations.

199. Fourthly, Thailand upholds as one of the fundamental principles that any foreign military occupation of another State's territory is unacceptable. In this connection, we have continually called for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967.

200. Fifthly, Thailand opposes any actions that are not in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations or not in conformity with the rules and norms of international law. That is why Thailand opposes Israel's *de facto* annexation of Jerusalem, its claimed status as Israel's capital, or any changes in the legal or demographic status of the Holy City. That is also why Thailand has never accepted Israel's *de facto* annexation of the Golan Heights or Israeli settlements in the West Bank or other occupied Arab territories; and that is why Thailand has consistently condemned the violations of the rights of the people in the occupied Arab territories, as well as the rights of refugees in the area. In this connection, we recall the tragic fate of the Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila camps.

201. Sixthly, Thailand firmly believes that all international problems could and should be solved in a peaceful manner. Therefore, we strongly support any attempt aimed at the attainment of a negotiated settlement. In this connection, we reaffirm our support of the plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[4] without prejudice to Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and other relevant United Nations resolutions. However, it is recognized that, in view of the long-standing injustices, there is no alternative to the continuation of the Palestinians' struggle for their legitimate rights by all available means.

202. My delegation would like to pay a warm tribute to the untiring efforts of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People under the chairmanship of Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal. Apart from the intrinsic value of the Committee's report [*A/39/35*], the fact that that Committee continues to perform its functions with dedication demonstrates the need for the continued support of the international community.

203. My delegation sincerely believes that, in order to reach a negotiated solution, a climate of confidence and understanding between all parties is necessary. Such an atmosphere could be brought about only by means of two factors: one is the unequivocal recognition of Palestinian rights by all the parties and the other is the political will to compromise in the best interests of regional peace and the security of all States. Efforts in such directions will indeed be necessary and useful in creating an atmosphere conducive to a just and lasting solution.

204. Finally, my delegation would like to urge all parties concerned to exert every effort to revitalize the peace process in the region so that a comprehensive political settlement encompassing the legitimate rights and aspirations of all concerned parties could become a reality. Essentially, we demand the prompt withdrawal of all Israeli forces from the Arab territories occupied since 1967 and full Israeli compliance with and implementation of all relevant United Nations resolutions. When the inalienable and legitimate rights of the Palestinian people have been exercised, then the international community will have performed its duty in the interest of peace and justice for all mankind.

205. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like first of all to express my thanks and appreciation to Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and to

the other members of the Committee for the great efforts they have made and the active role they have assumed in the search for a just solution of the question of Palestine and in defence of the rights of the Palestinian people, in accordance with the rules of international law and the principles of justice, right and peace.

206. The General Assembly is considering the question of Palestine at this session after having commemorated, a few days ago, the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. On that occasion, a number of messages of solidarity were received from the Heads of State and Ministers for Foreign Affairs of many countries, including Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of the Republic of Iraq. In his message, the President referred to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the need to make efforts in order to find a just and lasting solution to the question, which is vital for peace and security not only in the Arab region but also in the world. The participation of the international community, expressed through the messages of world leaders, in that commemoration strengthened the faith of the Arab nation in the cause of the Palestinian people and the confidence of that people in its future and in the inevitability of its victory over aggression and occupation when it will have regained its inalienable right to return to its country, to self-determination and to establish its own independent State, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations.

207. The fact that the United Nations continues to devote attention and time to considering the question of Palestine shows very clearly the depth of the concern and anxiety of the international community as a result of the aggression and occupation being inflicted on the Palestinian people, whose cause is the very core of the Arab-Zionist conflict.

208. Israel is continuing its aggression and occupation of the Arab lands. It is continuing the illegal establishment of settlements in the occupied Palestinian and Arab lands, disregarding General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. The West Bank, Gaza, Al-Quds, the Golan Heights and a large part of Lebanon are still under Israeli occupation, which is transforming the Arab region into one of the most explosive areas, thus endangering international peace and security.

209. The aggressive Israeli practices and the insistence of the Tel Aviv leaders on continuing their occupation and annexation of Palestinian lands are the main source of the plight and sufferings of the heroic people of Palestine. The Zionists are trying to crush the rights of the Palestinian people by subjecting them to the most horrendous forms of repression, deportation and genocide. It should be remembered that the Zionist occupation of Arab and Palestinian lands is intensifying and that the inhuman Israeli practices against the Palestinian people in the West Bank, Gaza and Lebanon are continuing openly and with unabated brutality, in complete disregard of international law and the principles of justice and morality and with no reference to the resolutions of the United Nations or to world public opinion.

210. Through its fight for freedom and its struggle to regain its inalienable right to return and to establish an independent State, the Palestinian people is giving us one of the finest examples of heroism. It is a miscalculation for the Israeli Zionists to believe that their policy of repression, genocide, conspiracy and treachery will silence the Palestinian people and force it to give up arms and abandon its struggle for liberation.

211. The aspiration of the Palestinian people to freedom and its continued determination to attain its noble objectives are closely linked with the PLO, which is the expression of the free will of the Palestinian people. In this connection, we are duty-bound to express once again, in the strongest possible terms, our support for and solidarity with the PLO and its legitimate leadership and for unity within the ranks of Palestinian resistance against all conspiracies and machinations, which are but part of Zionist schemes conceived to eliminate the question of Palestine and suppress the heroic Arab people of Palestine.

212. In our view, the fact that the United Nations persists in inscribing the question of Palestine on its agenda is of positive significance, for the international community hopes to achieve justice and refuses to accept facts based on aggression, brute force and expansionist designs. The international community also refuses to accept the unjust treatment meted out to the United Nations by the Zionist entity and its allies. Moreover, the United Nations has a confirmed responsibility in connection with all questions of liberation and especially the implementation of the right to self-determination, which has become a corner-stone of the international political order represented in the Charter of the United Nations.

213. For years the Palestinian people has been subjected to oppression and terror. It has been deprived of elementary human and political rights. This heroic people was obliged to resort to its legitimate right of self-defence to counter aggression against it by using all the means defined by the United Nations. The Palestinian people, through its long struggle, has made great material and moral sacrifices. In circumstances of a unique character, and in spite of exceptional circumstances and particularly difficult conditions, and in spite of conspiracies directed against it, this people has been able to uncover the misleading and tendentious character of the Zionist propaganda and prove to the world that the Zionist entity is the major and direct source of danger to peace in the Middle East.

214. For years, the Zionist entity has been resorting to practices designed to appropriate a Palestine without Palestinians. To that end, that entity has waged a systematic campaign of genocide against the Palestinians, using all methods of violence, terror and mass murder. Since its very inception, the Zionist entity has pursued a policy of racial discrimination against those Palestinians who did not leave their homeland. It considers them to be third-class citizens and has expropriated their property and trampled upon their rights. In 1967, Israel embarked on the policy of establishing settlements on the land of the expelled owners. It has demolished homes and closed down schools and universities. Moreover, it has permitted the establishment of armed Fascist, Zionist gangs which kill Palestinians in broad daylight.

215. These terrorist, repressive policies are designed to achieve one goal: the liquidation and depersonalization of the Palestinians, in order to force them to leave their homeland so that all of

Palestine can be transformed into an exclusively Jewish area.

216. Continued aggression and violation of international law and conventions are characteristic of the aggressive Zionist policy against the Arab nation. Under the pretext of security considerations, Israel has annexed the Syrian Golan Heights and has changed the demographic character of the occupied territories, in order to erase their Arab identity. It profaned the Al-Aqsa mosque and declared Jerusalem its eternal capital, thus antagonizing millions of Muslims and Christians. Moreover, in 1981 Israel destroyed, with its military aircraft, the Iraqi nuclear research facility, which was devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes. The international community condemned this criminal act. The international community also rejected the annexation of Jerusalem and of the Syrian Golan Heights, which was in contravention of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. In addition to that series of aggressive acts, Israel invaded Lebanon and engaged in mass murder and terror against Palestinians and Lebanese. It is still occupying large parts of Lebanon, despite resolutions adopted by the Security Council calling for Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon, without any pre-conditions.

217. We believe that the Palestinian question is the core of the Middle East conflict. Therefore, peace cannot be achieved without the complete and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and without Israel's recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland and its right to self-determination and to sovereignty in its own independent State.

218. The Palestinian people has been waging a bitter struggle to regain its lawful rights. It is high time for the Palestinian people to be enabled to exercise its right to self-determination, to establish an independent State on its own land and to take its place among the other nations that, since the Second World War, have rid themselves of imperialism and become independent States. The Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, has proved that its vitality and unity cannot be broken by conspiracies and that its voice cannot be silenced by Zionist military repression. It has proved that its struggle will be crowned with success. The recent meeting of the Palestine National Council at Amman and the resolutions it adopted have amply demonstrated the unity between the Palestinian people and its leadership, represented by the PLO.

219. When one reviews the events of the past year and the efforts that have been made to achieve peace, it is difficult to see on the political horizon any signs of a solution to this problem or the least possibility of the restoration of peace, security and stability to the region. I would emphasize that the major cause of this is the Zionist entity's refusal to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations and the will of the international community. In this regard, we must bear in mind that attempts to disregard the Palestinian reality, to deny the Palestinians' right of return and right to self-determination and independence and to frustrate participation by the Palestinian people, through its legitimate representative, the PLO, will not advance the search for a just and lasting solution to the Palestinian problem or the establishment of peace in the region. Hence, we call upon the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, especially those relating to the implementation of its resolutions and those of the General Assembly, as called for in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[3] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, and by world public opinion.

220. Iraq is determined to shoulder its responsibilities and to furnish all possible assistance to the Arab people of Palestine and the PLO. We call for a halt to the support given the Zionist aggressor by some international quarters, especially the United States, because such support encourages it to continue its aggressive policy against the Arab people in the occupied Arab territories and frustrates the efforts to achieve peace and to reach a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

221. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of Palestine is the core of the prolonged conflict in the Middle East. If it is not solved, there can be no stability or tranquillity in that region. For years, the United Nations and its various organs have been addressing themselves to this problem. Meetings and debates have taken place, recommendations and resolutions have been adopted, but the situation remains unchanged: the Palestinian people is still under the occupation and oppression of Israeli zionism, and it still is denied its homeland.

222. As it has done on other occasions, the Albanian delegation reaffirms that the cause of the serious situation in the Middle East, and in particular the serious situation of the Palestinian people, is the aggressive attitude of Israeli zionism and the hegemonistic policy of the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

223. Israeli zionism is pursuing ever more fiercely its policy of genocide against the Palestinians in the occupied Arab territories, and this has become the main method of perpetuating its occupation. Everyone is aware of the crimes committed by the Israeli Zionists against the Palestinian people, which has been the victim of unprecedented terror. Assassination, detention and persecution have become daily practices by the Israeli occupiers. They have such blind hatred for the Palestinians that they have no hesitation about committing the most monstrous acts, such as the tragic massacres in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila. Fascist Zionist packs are in full cry, hunting Palestinian "game". The Tel Aviv gangsters accompany this ferocious terror by stepping up the policy of Judaizing the occupied territories. This is carried out by forcibly expelling the Palestinians from their lands and by gathering them together in camps encircled with barbed wire, camps absolutely indistinguishable from concentration camps. To replace the Palestinians on their land, Jews from the four corners of the world continue to settle, in furtherance of the old goal of zionism: to perpetuate the occupation of the Arab lands. In a word, the Israeli Zionists have mobilized their entire military and economic potential in their crusade against the Palestinian people. Israel's arrogant policy against the Palestinians and against the Arab peoples in the Middle East in general could not be pursued were it not for the overall tense situation in that region which is the result of the expansionist policy of the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. Israeli zionism has used, and continues to

use, that situation in its anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab activities.

224. It is from that viewpoint, too, that we must examine the plots being hatched against the just cause of the Palestinian people, served up in various guises by both Washington and Moscow. The din they make over their supposed desire for a peaceful solution of the question of the Palestinian people, in fact, is totally incompatible—as the facts have shown—with the basic aspirations of the Palestinian people: the restoration of all their legitimate rights, and a homeland in which they can live in freedom, sovereignty and independence.

225. The United States imperialists do not conceal their hostility towards the Palestinian people and its cause. Openly and arrogantly, they deny its legitimate rights. This hatred is manifested through their tool, Israel, which they have armed to the teeth, turning it into a military terrorist State.

226. It is clear to all that, without the weapons, assistance and financial and political support of the United States, Israel would be unable to do what it is doing against the Palestinian people and in the Middle East in general.

227. As to the Soviet social-imperialists, their acts and their noisy statements, supposedly in support of the Palestinian people and the Arab peoples in general, are nothing but pure demagogy. This so-called support has always been tactical, and it is in keeping with the Soviet Union's imperialist interest in the Middle East. Tens of thousands of Jews who have emigrated from the Soviet Union have moved as settlers into the occupied territories; this emigration is aimed against the Palestinian people. In short, the "peace" plans for the Middle East, whether American or Soviet, do not point to a just solution of the Palestinian question, but rather conceal anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab activities and are in accordance with the long-range objectives of those Powers to gain hegemony in the region.

228. Even faced with a ferocious, bloodthirsty occupier such as Israel and with the diabolical plots of the super-Powers, the Palestinian people has been neither demoralized nor brought to its knees. Quite the contrary: it has brought to bear on this difficult and complex situation its great will, its ardent aspirations and its unshakeable determination to gain its legitimate rights and to achieve what is most sacred to it: return to its homeland, which has been occupied by the Israeli Zionists. Nothing—neither the most sophisticated weaponry of the Israeli aggressor nor the plots of the imperialists—has succeeded or will succeed in crushing its struggle.

229. The Albanian people and its Government have always supported the just cause of the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples; it supports and will always support them, unswervingly, in their struggle, for it is a struggle for the legitimate and inalienable right of a people to free its pillaged homeland. We wish to take this opportunity also to reiterate our condemnation of those who are inflicting suffering and privation on the Palestinian people: the Zionist occupiers and the two imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

230. We have said before, and we repeat now, that the Palestinian problem can be solved only when the Israeli aggressors are expelled from the occupied territories, when the ferocious genocide against the Palestinian people is ended, and when the intervention in the Middle East of the two super-Powers and other imperialist Powers is blocked.

231. Our consistent position in support of the just cause of the Palestinian people has been stated in detail by the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, in his recently published book, *Reflections on the Middle East*,[8] in which he wrote:

> "Our people feels special sympathy for the Palestinian people, for it has waged and is waging a determined, heroic struggle. We have supported it, and we shall support it, though it find itself on a sea of solitude and betrayal. However betrayed and abandoned it may be at present, the Palestinian people will triumph. It will triumph because it is fighting for a just cause, for return to its homeland, usurped by the Israeli aggressors with the open support of the United States imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and reactionary forces from various Arab countries."

232. Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): The debate on the item which is again before the General Assembly—the question of Palestine—has once more revealed the complete unanimity of all delegations on the urgent need for a settlement of the Palestine problem.

233. There are two major reasons for this urgency. The first is that a nation of almost 5 million people, with a distinctive, historically developed national character, must no longer be denied the basic right to self-determination. The second is that any further delay in the settlement of the Palestinian problem will inevitably lead to the worsening of the already dangerous situation in that sensitive part of the world, jeopardizing peace and security in the region and in the world at large.

234. On numerous occasions, Poland has pointed out that the Middle East conflict, with the Palestinian problem at its core, is one of the main sources of tension in the world. For many years, it has been a source of the destabilization of peace and security in the region. The elimination of these threats is vital to all nations of that region and is in the interests of world peace.

235. My country has never been indifferent about the question of peace in the Middle East. A political manifestation of our stance has been Poland's active participation in United Nations peace-keeping efforts in the region, first in UNEF and now in UNDOF. The dedicated service of the Polish soldiers in the Middle East under the United Nations flag constitutes my country's direct contribution to the restoration of peace in the region.

236. In the opinion of the Polish Government, the main obstacle to the establishment of a lasting and just peace in the Middle East is the Israeli occupation of Arab territories in the wake of the 1967 war, the invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and, further, the total disregard of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Such a situation is the result of the expansionist Israeli policy.

237. That Israeli expansionism, manifesting itself in violations of principles of international law and disregard of the numerous relevant United Nations resolutions, found expression also in the annexation of the eastern part of Jerusalem and the extension of Israeli jurisdiction and administration to the Syrian Golan Heights.

238. The Government of the Polish People's Republic strongly condemns acts which are contrary to

the Charter of the United Nations. We condemn the Israeli policy of colonizing the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, as well as all acts of repression and discrimination against the Palestinians, as actions contrary to international law. At the same time, Poland firmly supports the justified aspirations of the Palestinian people to enjoyment of its inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State, with guarantees for the peaceful existence and security of all nations and countries in the region.

239. This debate confirms once again that any just and lasting solution to the situation in the region should include, first and foremost, a solution to the question of Palestine. And the only possible framework for such a solution is the United Nations, with its existing resolutions pertaining to the question of Palestine. This solution should be reached through convening an international conference on peace in the Middle East, with the participation, on an equal footing, of all the parties—that is, all the States concerned and the PLO, and also the Soviet Union and the United States as co-chairmen of the 1973 conference on the Middle East. We have expressed this position many times, together with other socialist States, and we have also supported the initiative of the Secretary-General regarding the convening of such a conference. On 29 July 1984, the Government of the Soviet Union made detailed proposals concerning a Middle East settlement [*see A/39/368*]. There have already been numerous references to those proposals in this debate. I shall confine myself to stating my Government's position on the Soviet proposals, and I quote from a statement of the Polish Ministry for Foreign Affairs made in connection with the statement of the Soviet Union on the Middle East conflict on 29 July 1984:

> "These are highly concrete proposals. They clearly determine the goals of the conference, objectively justify its composition of participation and submit a series of constructive suggestions concerning the organization of the conference's work. The Polish People's Republic is of the opinion that the programme of action suggested in the statement has all the elements which are preconditions for the attainment of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict."

240. May I add that the Polish People's Republic fully supports the initiative of the Soviet Union and is ready to make a positive contribution to this process.

241. Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The commemoration by the international community last week of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People and the dedication of the interest of the international community to the cause of that people is a reaffirmation of the consistent support given to the right of that people to establish a sovereign State of its own on its national territory and to exercise its right of self-determination. The commemoration was especially important this year in view of the situation in the region, as in the rest of the world. The situation reveals that the Palestinian problem is at the heart of the conflict in the Middle East and, like an erupting volcano, will continue to threaten peace and security throughout the world unless a just and lasting solution is found.

242. The struggle of the Palestinian people has taught us many lessons. The Palestinian problem will continue to fan the flames of conflict in the Middle East if the sufferings of the Palestinian people continue. Whereas the Palestinian people have constantly given new proof of the justice of their cause, Israel for its part obstinately refuses to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and rejects all efforts towards peace, in the absence of a deterrent force that would finally compel it to comply with the will of the international community.

Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Vice-President, took the Chair.

243. Israel has chosen to wage a merciless war against the Arab people of Palestine. Expansionism, occupation and the annexation of land by force of arms have become the declared policy of the Tel Aviv leaders, with all its implications in acts of aggression; the bombing of civilian populations, including old people, women and children; the destruction of holy places, especially Islamic holy places; the Judaization of lands; the sacrifice of innocent human lives; the escalation of the tension; and the continuing conflict, with the destructive and tragic dimensions of which we are all aware.

244. We deplore the continuance of this inhuman situation, with the Palestinian people still prisoners in camps, despite the many United Nations resolutions on this question. Nothing seems able to stay the criminal arm of Israel, which is continuing through all its practices to challenge international resolutions and decisions. It is clear that the international community must shoulder its responsibilities in order to avert the dangers involved in Israel's practices.

245. Israel has obdurately rejected all peace initiatives, notably the resolutions of the United Nations, as well as the peace plan put forward at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference.[4] That plan expressed the desire of the Arab nations for a just peace, while Israel rejects all efforts to bring about peace, because it is an aggressive State that does not want peace.

246. In view of the general discouragement, in view of Israel's attempts to impose a peace based on the policy of force carried out by its political and military institutions, the International Conference on the Question of Palestine was held at Geneva in 1983, under United Nations auspices. That conference marked an important turning-point because it made it possible for the international community, represented by a number of very important participants, to reaffirm its principles for the solution of this problem in the framework of international legality. Thanks to this conference, the international community was able to affirm that there could be no just and lasting peace in the Middle East without complete and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and without permitting the Palestinian people to exercise its rights to self-determination, to return home, to recover its property and to establish a sovereign and independent State on its national land, under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative. Those principles will remain solid foundations for a just and solid peace, not a peace imposed at gunpoint.

247. The PLO has demonstrated that it is a party with which serious discussions can be held in all efforts towards peace in the Middle East. The obstacles it has faced have not diminished its determination to pursue its struggle to obtain a just and comprehensive settlement. The Palestine National Council, meeting at Amman only a few days ago, expressed the protests of Arabs and Palestinians against the crimes committed by Israel. That Council made it possible to show how strongly the Palestinian people supports the PLO, its sole legitimate representative. The Council reaffirmed its complete confidence in the elected Palestinian leaders, under the chairmanship of Mr. Yasser Arafat. As Mr. Kaddoumi said yesterday in this forum [*88th meeting*], the recent meeting of the Palestine National Council was an important event which reaffirmed the existence of special relations between the Palestinian and Jordanian peoples and their unshakeable dedication to a concerted Arab approach to liberating Arab lands and enabling the Palestinian people to exercise its legitimate and inalienable rights.

248. We are all aware that the collaboration that has been established between the Tel Aviv and Pretoria régimes also constitutes a threat jeopardizing security in both the Arab and African regions and undermines the struggles being waged by the Arab and African peoples for freedom and independence. This alliance has been denounced many times in various regional and international forums, and we condemn it forcefully. The international community must redouble its efforts not to hamper the realization of the legitimate aims of the Arab and African peoples.

249. The Palestinian problem will remain the bench-mark whereby the United Nations can measure its ability to restore legitimate rights to peoples seeking them and can measure its credibility, and will enable us to see how far we can live up to the aspirations with which we have been entrusted.

250. To conclude, let me say that the efforts exerted by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, under the effective guidance of its Chairman, Mr. Sarré, of Senegal, and of its Rapporteur, Mr. Gauci, of Malta, deserve a vote of thanks on behalf of the Sudan and the support of all of us. The Committee has played an important role in making the international community aware of the sufferings of the Palestinian people and the legitimacy of its struggle. The Committee also made praiseworthy efforts in preparing for the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, and in drawing up the extremely valuable report that the Assembly has before it [*A/39/35*], a report which has our full support. We hope that these efforts will be continued so as to make it possible for the national aspirations of the Palestinian people to be realized.

251. Mr. NGONDA (Zambia): The Assembly once again is taking up the question of Palestine in the continuing quest for a comprehensive and lasting solution to this vexing problem.

252. The Palestinian people yearns for peace, freedom and independence in a State of its own. All peoples everywhere that cherish peace, freedom and justice are concerned that Israel, in violation of numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, has continued to establish new settlements in the occupied Arab territories, thereby deepening tension in the area. Those who entertain the dangerous notion that peace in the Middle East can be guaranteed by increasing Israel's capacity to maintain its unwarranted occupation of Arab lands should by now have realized that their blind support for the Jewish State has had the negative effect of exacerbating tension in the region.

253. There can be no doubt that the question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East problem. The Palestinians are a dispossessed people because of Israel's expansionist policies. A permanent and lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict will continue to elude us so long as Israel stubbornly refuses to withdraw from all the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967. Respect for the Palestinian people's inalienable right to self-determination and independence in a State of its own is certainly a *sine qua non* for peace in the region. There can be no peace in the Middle East if a comprehensive solution to the question of Palestine is not found. It is indeed the height of naïvety to assume or even imagine otherwise.

254. Zambia attaches the greatest importance to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force. This is a cardinal principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations to which all States must scrupulously adhere. We have thus supported whole-heartedly Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and other resolutions and decisions.

255. We believe that the Palestinian question can be resolved through negotiations between all parties to the conflict. To this end, we urge all parties to the conflict to heed the call of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, in which the two super-Powers would participate, together with all parties to the conflict, including the PLO, on an equal basis. Although there is a virtual consensus on the part of the international community on the imperative need to resolve the question of Palestine once and for all, the negative attitude of Israel and the United States, to which the Secretary-General refers in his report [*see A/39/130/Add. 1*], has made it impossible to translate that consensus into reality.

256. The Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, meeting at Fez on 9 September 1982, adopted an important document[4] containing principles that could help to bring about peace in the region. Continued tension in the area poses a serious threat to international peace and security.

257. My delegation wishes to reaffirm Zambia's support for and solidarity with the Palestinian people in their just and heroic struggle to achieve their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence. We reaffirm also our support for the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

258. Israel's peace and security lie in its readiness to co-operate with the United Nations in the implementation of the relevant resolutions.

259. I wish, in conclusion, to commend the Chairman and other members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for their tireless efforts in the fulfilment of the Committee's mandate.

260. Mr. DIACONU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Palestine, one of the most serious that the United Nations has had to face since its earliest years, is being considered this year in an extremely complicated international situation which seriously jeopardizes peace and security in the Middle East and in the entire world.

261. The continuance of the conflict in the Middle East, the illegal occupation by Israel of Palestinian and Arab territories and the state of violence and confrontation that persists in the occupied territories and throughout the area are likely to engender new confrontations, causing the peoples of the region increasing loss of life and material damage and threatening international peace.

262. The evolution of the situation in the Middle East makes more clear than ever the truth that the Palestinian problem constitutes the central element in the Israeli-Arab conflict. Clearly, a comprehensive, lasting solution to this conflict and a climate of tranquillity and co-operation cannot be assured without a just settlement of this problem and the exercise by the Palestinian people of their legitimate right to determine their own destiny and to live in their own independent State.

263. The whole course of history, furthermore, has established the truth that a people cannot base its security and independence on the denial of the right of other peoples to exist and to independence or on the threat or use of force against other States and peoples. The truth is that peace and security can be achieved only through respect for the rights of other countries and for the principles and norms of international law.

264. Hence, recognition of and respect for the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, while guaranteeing the conditions in which they can fulfil their national aspiration to live in peace and tranquillity in their own independent State, is in the interest of all the peoples of the region and of peace and security throughout the world.

265. Taking as its point of departure the requirement that all conflicts and matters of dispute must be settled solely by peaceful means, through negotiations, Romania has always called firmly for a political solution to the problems of the Middle East that would guarantee the establishment of a comprehensive peace in the region, as well as the solution of the problem of the Palestinian people on the basis of its right to self-determination, including its right to set up an independent Palestinian State.

266. My country has consistently emphasized that the Palestinian people, like all other peoples, have an inalienable right to organize their life in accordance with their national aspirations and to exercise their right to self-determination, including the right to set up an independent State. We have frequently expressed our unshakeable conviction that, without the solution of the problem of the Palestinian people on the basis of their right to self-determination, no peace in the Middle East is possible. Faithful to its policy of principle, Romania has never failed to adhere to its position that the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must participate on an equal footing in the process of settling the problem of the Palestinian people and the overall problem of the Middle East.

267. A comprehensive solution must lead to the achievement of a just and lasting peace and guarantee the independence and sovereignty of all the States of the region.

268. As everybody knows, a number of initiatives have been taken and efforts made, especially in recent years, by Member States and by the United Nations to settle by peaceful means, through negotiations, the many and varied aspects of the Israeli-Arab conflict, in particular the Palestinian problem.

269. In 1983, the General Assembly endorsed the proposal of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva that year, to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East. A similar idea had been put forward in 1978 by the President of Romania, and since that time my country has never failed to take a very firm position in favour of such a conference, with the participation of all States concerned and of the PLO, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

270. We feel that this initiative is just as valid today and that efforts are necessary by all States and by the international community in order that the conference may be convened as soon as possible.

271. We share the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his report on the situation in the Middle East [*A/39/600*] that such a conference might be conceived as a flexible framework for the necessary negotiations to settle all the questions involved in the Middle East conflict. Similarly, we agree with other delegations that the time has come for all the countries concerned and all political forces in the region to promote the organizing of such a conference, which would be a significant contribution to the search for the comprehensive and just solution so long awaited by the peoples of that region and of the entire world.

272. Romania and the Romanian people have consistently expressed their support for the just cause of the Palestinian people, for its legitimate aspirations to live in freedom in an independent State and for its inalienable right to self-determination. Romania was among the first countries of the world to recognize the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

273. In a telegram sent recently by President Nicolae Ceauşescu to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, Mr. Yasser Arafat, to congratulate him on his re-election to that post, the conviction was expressed that relations of friendship and beneficial co-operation between the Romanian Communist Party and the PLO would continue to expand and be diversified, to the benefit of both peoples and in the cause of peace, independence and international co-operation.

274. We feel that the United Nations can and must play a more active role in efforts aimed at solving the Middle East conflict and settling the Palestinian problem and that under its auspices comprehensive negotiations can be embarked upon so as to bring about, in that very troubled region of the world, a just and lasting peace that would fully meet the hopes and expectations of the peoples of the region and of the entire world.

275. Undertaking measures and making efforts by political means to find a settlement for all aspects of the Middle East conflict—first and foremost, the Palestinian problem—is in full conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the legitimate needs of its States Mem-

bers and of the peoples of the region and of the entire world.

276. For its part, Romania is determined, now and in the future, to make its own contribution to finding a comprehensive and lasting solution to the problems of the Middle East, to the establishment of a just peace in the region and to the consolidation of peace, security and international co-operation.

277. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Only a few days ago, the United Nations observed the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, a day on which we all reflected on the plight of the Palestinians in their just and prolonged struggle for self-determination. The observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People in various capitals of the world, including mine, not only underscored the concern of the world over their tragic situation but also the need for concerted international action aimed at resolving the crisis with a great sense of urgency.

278. On that solemn occasion—the observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People—my Head of State, in his message, took the opportunity to:

> "reassure the people of Palestine that Nigeria will continue to exert the utmost efforts within the international community aimed at achieving a comprehensive, just and equitable solution of the Middle East problem, which will restore and guarantee their sovereign right".

279. The question of Palestine has occupied a prominent position in the agenda and deliberations of the United Nations since its inception. This demonstrates the crucial nature of the crisis in the Middle East, where human rights and justifiable claims to self-determination are consistently and flagrantly denied in spite of continuous international efforts to resolve the crisis.

280. My delegation has read with considerable interest the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*A/39/35*]. We appreciate the Committee's efforts to assist in finding a solution to the prolonged crisis. We note with regret that Israel has continued to establish more settlements in the occupied territories, aimed at making its hold on those territories irreversible. Obviously, Israeli policies in those territories do have negative effects on the Palestinians. They include restrictions on their possession of cultivable land and water resources and, indeed, the wholesale expulsion and confiscation of their land. Those measures, we believe, exacerbate an already explosive situation and can only make solution much more difficult. The right to self-determination is one to which the Palestinians are entitled. It is a right recognized by the United Nations as being inalienable. Israel cannot therefore expect the international community to remain unconcerned and not support the struggle of the Palestinians.

281. Israel has persistently refused to accept that the resolve of the Palestinians to establish their own homeland—as the Israelis themselves have done—cannot be thwarted by military force. This is amply proved by the fact that, in spite of Israel's military aggression, demonstrated by the two invasions of Lebanon, the latter of which led to the horrifying massacre of innocent Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila camps, Palestinians continue to fight for their inalienable rights without let-up.

282. Certainly, force has never provided a lasting solution to any problem. As the Nigerian Minister for External Affairs stated in the Assembly on 8 October:

> "The international community has in the recent past witnessed the futility of attempting to find a military solution or of imposing a lopsided super-Power solution to the Middle East problem. The invasion of Lebanon by Israel in 1982 and the tragic failure of the ill-advised mission of the so-called multinational force in Lebanon are both classic examples of the limits to the use of military power.
>
> "The solution lies in a negotiated peace, a peace that is just, equitable and fair, a peace that recognizes the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to return to their homeland and to establish their own independent State in Palestine." [*25th meeting, paras. 122 and 123.*]

283. Along these lines, my delegation would like to re-emphasize its support for General Assembly resolution 38/79 C, which demands that the Government of Israel desist from taking any action that would alter the legal status, geographical nature or demographic composition of the occupied territories. We call upon Israel to withdraw immediately all its troops from Arab territories. That would be a step in the right direction towards achieving lasting peace in the region.

284. After years of neglect of the indispensable role of the Palestinians in the Middle East equation, in recent years the United Nations has demonstrated, by the adoption of numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, its determination to resolve the Palestinian question, which, we believe, is the core of the Middle East crisis. Indeed, it was in pursuance of this worthy objective that the International Conference on the Question of Palestine was convened, in 1983, at which the Geneva Declaration on Palestine was adopted.[3]

285. While I do not intend to go into the details of that Declaration, I feel obliged to emphasize a crucial point that must be taken into consideration in any attempt to resolve the situation, namely, the right of the PLO, the authentic representative of the Palestinians, to participate in all deliberations on the Middle East on an equal footing with other parties. We firmly believe that, to achieve a lasting solution, all the parties involved must demonstrate a willingness to negotiate with each other.

286. It is in this spirit that my delegation commends the Secretary-General's efforts to initiate preparations to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. We regret that his efforts so far have not yielded positive results owing to the reluctance of two countries whose participation in such a conference is crucial. We believe that such a conference, with the participation of Israel, the United States, the Soviet Union, the PLO and other parties involved, would pave the way for a genuine effort to resolve the Middle East crisis peacefully. We therefore call on all Members of the United Nations to give serious thought to the recommendation of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People that international action should concentrate on preparations for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. We urge all Members,

including Israel and the United States, to lend their support to the efforts of the United Nations towards a just and durable solution of the Palestinian question and therefore of the Middle East question in general.

287. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): The question of Palestine is characterized by considerable human suffering, deep-rooted political differences, complex and diverse approaches to the dispute, armed conflicts or wars and elements of tension likely to threaten peace and security in the region.

288. In practical terms, the question of Palestine has, in my delegation's view, assumed three major dimensions: namely, the existence and suffering of the Palestine refugees; the political dilemma, which has evaded solution for many years; and the military aspect, so that the States in the region in particular and other influential States in general have a direct interest in the outcome of any series of negotiations or consultations or armed conflicts.

289. It is my delegation's intention not to live in the past but to learn from history if we are to appreciate fully the current political predicament faced by all parties to the dispute, which is reflected in the prevailing bedevilled relations, suspicion and uncertainty.

290. A look at the history of armed conflicts demonstrates that human suffering and human consciousness must always be remembered by the world community if it is to promote peaceful coexistence and prevent human tragedies. There is history in the conduct and behaviour of human societies. Any observer who believes that some human beings have no history worth mentioning assumes that there is no humanity worth defending.

291. It is on this basis that my delegation wishes to refer to several wars that have left scars of bitterness and suspicion in the Middle East, such as the wars of 1948, 1967 and 1973, coupled with intermittent armed conflicts or raids, which resulted and continue to result in substantial human suffering, loss of human life and indescribable destruction of personal property and economic infrastructures.

292. In order to arrest this sad state of affairs and in an endeavour to find a peaceful settlement of the dispute, several Middle East initiatives have been undertaken, and I would like to mention some of the major ones.

293. The first of these initiatives was the negotiations leading to the Camp David accords, signed by Israel and Egypt, under the chairmanship of the former President of the United States, Mr. Carter. Under those accords, it will be recalled, Sinai was returned to Egypt but the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip, a part of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights remained occupied by Israel.

294. The second initiative was announced on 1 September 1982 by President Reagan of the United States,[7] and its content is well known to members of the Assembly.

295. The third initiative was the plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference.[4]

296. The fourth initiative was taken by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, when the Conference recognized, in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, that the question of Palestine

> "requires a comprehensive, just and lasting political settlement. This settlement must be based on the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions concerning the question of Palestine and the attainment of the legitimate, inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination and the right to the establishment of its own independent State in Palestine, and should also be based on the provision by the Security Council of guarantees for peace and security among all States in the region, including the independent Palestinian State, within secure and internationally recognized boundaries."[9]

297. In his report on the situation in the Middle East [*A/39/600*], the Secretary-General has pointed out that a comprehensive settlement of the dispute would have to involve the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from occupied territories; respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force; and a just settlement of the Palestinian problem based on recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of self-determination. He also said that the question of Jerusalem remains of primary importance.

298. It is against this background that many resolutions have been adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly in the past, coupled with other resolutions adopted in various international forums. Unfortunately, a political solution to this problem has not yet been achieved, largely because of practical difficulties and procedural reservations in regard to one key issue: namely, the need to reconcile self-determination and the establishment of an independent State for the Palestinians with recognition of Israel as a State within secure and internationally recognized borders. This is the kernel of the problem.

299. I should like at this stage to point out that my delegation's position with regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict is guided by several principles. First, Malawi believes that Israel has the right to exist as a sovereign State and to live within secure borders, and at the same time it supports the principle of self-determination for the Palestinian people. Secondly, Malawi opposes the use of force or violence to settle the problems pertaining to the question of Palestine. Thirdly, my delegation reiterates that the Government of the Republic of Malawi believes that a meaningful and lasting solution can be achieved only through the full participation of all the parties in the search for it.

300. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to appeal to all parties involved for restraint where revenge is dictated, for compromise where peace and security are threatened, for forgiveness where human mistakes have inadvertently been made, for reconciliation where animosity rules, for contact and dialogue where isolation is the order of the day, and for constructive involvement where ideological differences separate the super-Powers.

301. Geographically, Malawi is separated from the Middle East, but distance in time or space will not be allowed to dim its burning desire for a peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine.

Programme of Work

302. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Assembly that I have received two additional formal requests to extend the deadline for the submission to the Fifth Committee of all draft resolutions with programme budget implications. The Chairmen of the Special Political Committee and the Second Committee have requested an extension until 10 December in connection with agenda item 74, as well as items 12, 80 and 82 respectively.

303. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to extend the deadlines accordingly?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915), p. 100.

[3] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[4] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[5] See A/38/132 and Corr. 1 and 2, chap. I.

[6] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1983*, document S/15556.

[7] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[8] Tirana, "8 NËNTORI" Publishing House, 1984.

[9] *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I, sect. A, para. 2.

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

92nd
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 10 December 1984,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine (*continued*)

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The frustration which we feel at the fact that a further year has elapsed without our having been able to make any progress towards a solution of the Palestinian problem should serve as an incentive to all Member States of the United Nations to redouble our efforts to put an end to the untold sufferings of this heroic people.

2. Israel, whose sons themselves suffered physically the harsh and cruel misdeeds of fascism, has now itself become a causer of victims rather than a victim, driving the Palestinians from their land and depriving them of their most elementary rights.

3. Nevertheless, although the Palestinians are forced to live as wanderers, they have not been overcome. They maintain at the highest level their traditional spirit of combat, which will lead them to struggle to the last man for their liberty and independence.

4. The courage and tenacity that have been demonstrated in the decades-long struggle under the leadership of their spokesman, the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*], against Zionist oppression have been combined by the Palestine people with a desire to seek a negotiated solution to the Palestinian question.

5. In this sense, it is worth recalling that any solution to the problems of the region will necessarily have to involve the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish their own State; the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem; the cessation of all acts of hostility against Arab States and the Palestinian people; and mutual recognition of the right of all States in the region to exist in peace.

6. An appropriate negotiating framework would be provided by the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all the parties involved, naturally including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and of other States concerned, such as the Soviet Union and the United States.

7. Unfortunately, as is reflected in the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/130 and Add.1*], the Governments of Israel and the United States have refused to participate in that conference.

8. In line with its aggressive, expansionist policy, the Government of Israel obstinately rejects any proposal for negotiations, irrespective of the form it may take. It also disregards the national identity and the rights of the Palestinian people and persists in repression, the settlements policy and its plans to annex the occupied Arab territories.

9. Furthermore, the intransigent attitude of Israel and its protective partner, the United States, has prevented compliance with the will of the international community as expressed in many resolutions of the United Nations.

10. This unconditional support of Israel by American imperialism, which includes the abuse of the privilege it enjoys under the Charter of the United Nations as a permanent member of the Security Council, is explained solely by the desire to defend its strategic interests in the region.

11. This brazen collusion was clearly seen in the strategic agreements concluded between Washington and Tel Aviv, which very soon resulted in the invasion and occupation of southern Lebanon.

12. In the mean time, both partners are bent on their policy aimed at the conclusion of separate agreements along the lines of the Camp David accords or of the agreement which patriotic resistance thwarted in Lebanon.

13. This type of agreement, which was condemned at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, does not resolve the fundamental problem of the Middle East conflict, namely, the question of Palestine; it ignores the role which the United Nations must play in the solution of that problem and is designed to destroy the unity and capacity for resistance of the Arab nation.

14. This shows how the imperialist policy in the Middle East subordinates the imperialists' alleged friendship with the Arabs to the interests of Israel. This betrayal, as more than one speaker has mentioned, shows once again that the present American Administration does not hesitate to disregard commitments entered into with its alleged allies and acts in defence of what best assures its strategic interests.

15. The international community must therefore bring all its influence to bear to make sure that Israel and the United States comply with their international obligations and are convinced that peace will not be obtained through separate agreements but, rather,

through a comprehensive solution under the auspices of the United Nations.

16. In the message addressed to Mr. Massamba Sarré, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, the President of the Council of State and Government of the Republic of Cuba, Fidel Castro, said:

> "In a situation characterized by the aggressive policy of imperialism, consisting in the continuous use of force and in intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other States and exacerbated by the danger posed by the extension of armed conflict, the international community, in particular the United Nations, must adopt effective measures aimed at reaching a settlement of existing crises and preventing the emergence of new ones. In this context, the Middle East crisis deserves priority attention, given the magnitude of the danger it poses to international peace and security."

17. Our country, which has always backed the heroic struggle of the Arab and Palestinian peoples against imperialism and zionism, will spare no efforts to bring about a comprehensive solution leading to the restoration of justice and peace in the region.

18. We would not wish to conclude without emphasizing the efforts made by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and affirming our support for the recommendations in its report to the General Assembly [*A/39/35*] and for the draft resolutions which have been submitted on the item.

19. We reaffirm our whole-hearted support for the Palestinian combatants and their sole legitimate representative, the PLO.

20. The unity of all Arab forces in facing the true common enemy has never been more necessary.

21. Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me pleasure at the outset to convey our thanks to Mr. Massamba Sarré, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and to the other members of the Committee on their lucid, objective and positive report [*ibid.*]. We appreciate the efforts made to discharge the mandate of the Committee and to follow closely events and developments on the question of Palestine.

22. The report of the Committee has covered basic aspects of that question, in particular those pertaining to Israeli policies and practices which prevent the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The Committee has also reported on the efforts being made within the United Nations system to put an end to those Israeli policies and practices.

23. During the past weeks of this session of the General Assembly we have examined a great many matters relating to the question of the Middle East which are closely connected to the question of Palestine. One may observe that such connections are continuously increasing, and if that fact sheds light on anything, it is that the question of Palestine is the origin and crux of the Middle East conflict. It also makes it clear that failure to settle this problem must, as in the past, have a negative effect on other problems and thus lead to a continuation and an exacerbation of tension.

24. The ongoing tragedy gives expression to the injustice and oppression inflicted upon the Palestinian people, who are driven from their country and denied their basic inalienable rights to live in peace in an independent homeland, as do the rest of the peoples of the earth. It also gives expression to the unjust attacks led by some world Powers against the Arab nation, seeking to infringe its dignity and independence. However, the continuation of the tragedy also gives rise to two basic phenomena. The first phenomenon is the fact that the people of Palestine, as a matter of principle, stick to their land and refuse attempts to obliterate their national identity. They stick to their inalienable rights and continue to resist the fiercest war machine, supported by the greatest political and economic Power. The second phenomenon is the fact that the Palestinian Arab nation refuses to compromise its independence and adheres to its basic principle of rejecting injustice and aggression.

25. The question of Palestine has become an international criterion by which to categorize world Powers and distinguish the forces of justice, right and peace from those of injustice and aggression.

26. Experience teaches us that Israel is a State based on aggression and the logic of power and that it has rejected any peaceful solution because peace is diametrically opposed to the Zionist doctrine on which Israeli society is built, a militaristic society which receives the basics of its life from abroad. That is why Israel has rejected every peace initiative made, as well as all the resolutions and initiatives of the United Nations. This confirms that Israel has no desire for or need of peace. Its position is based on racist Zionist convictions and depends on its war machine, supported by the United States.

27. That is why, during the forty years that the conflict has lasted,, we have not once heard Israel state clearly that it accepts peace as a possible alternative. All that we hear is the traditional talk about the "security of Israel". What is security for Israel? What are the borders of that security?

28. Are they the borders defined by General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, which established the State of Israel? Israel has gone beyond those borders and seized territories that are many times bigger than the area allocated to it by that resolution. Or are the borders of Israeli security those defined by Zionist doctrine—from the Euphrates to the Nile?

29. Is there any delegation in this Hall that can explain to us what are the borders of the "security of Israel"?

30. The Arabs made their situation clear in the Arab peace plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference.[1]

31. The United States defined its position in the Reagan initiative of 1 September 1982.[2]

32. The Soviet Union defined its position in the initiative of former President Brezhnev on 15 September 1982,[3] as well as in its proposals of 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*].

33. The international community has also defined its position, through General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, which provides for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. Israel has rejected all these initiatives. What, then, is Israel's alternative?

34. In the General Assembly we need someone to clarify to us what Israel wants, what its official position is, practically and realistically, with regard to the peace process in the Middle East.

35. In his book *Thorns in Your Eyes*, the Knesset member Meir Kahane expressed the Zionist opinion when he said: "The Jews have owned the land of Palestine. They gave it their name; therefore, it became Eretz Yisrael." He adds that the Palestinians have no right to that land because the land does not give its name to a people. Rather, it is the people that gives its name to the land—in Kahane's opinion. At the beginning of the session of the Knesset, the so-called Israeli Parliament, Kahane submitted two draft laws on citizenship which contained the principles set forth in his book, of which eight are the most important.

36. The first principle, according to Kahane, is that the Jewish people have the right to reside in Palestine as their State. Non-Jews, if they want to live in Israel, have to live as non-citizens with no political rights and in limited numbers.

37. The second basic principle concerns leaving Palestine: the Palestinians may, if they wish, emigrate to Arab States or to any other State. He believes that Arab States should give grants to Palestinians who choose to leave their land.

38. The third basic principle is that Palestinians who refuse to leave must declare in writing their loyalty to Israel, with a recognition of the fact that Palestine is the "land of the Jewish people". In addition, all Jews have an absolute right, in Kahane's eyes, to come to Palestine.

39. The fourth principle is that Arabs who refuse to leave or to accept the above-mentioned principles have, according to Kahane, to be forcibly expelled, without any compensation.

40. Kahane's fifth basic principle is that Arabs who take the oath of loyalty to the Jewish State can be expelled if ever a security charge is made against them. Kahane believes that imprisonment is not sufficient punishment: they must be expelled from the country.

41. Kahane's sixth basic principle is that all the Jews of the world are called upon to provide the necessary funds for Jews leaving their countries to go to Palestine.

42. The seventh principle is that "non-Jewish" inhabitants, on reaching the age of 18, must do compulsory work for three years, after which they must do compulsory work for one month a year. No Arab should be accepted by a university unless he takes an oath of loyalty to the Jewish State.

43. The eighth principle, according to Kahane, is that Arabs living in Palestine should pay all the taxes. It is abundantly clear that the ideas Kahane submitted to the Israeli Knesset are very similar to those on which the law on citizenship of the German Reich submitted by Hitler to the Reichstag in 1935 was based.

44. History has taught us that there have been many attempts to impede the long march towards progress, justice and equality. Among these we recall the Mogul invasion of western Asia and eastern Europe, the crusades against the Arab east, the racist Nazi movement and, finally, European colonization.

45. All these invasions, all these movements, all these theories went against the tide of history. That is why they were repelled. However, there are two political phenomena connected with the concepts of nazism and colonialism. These are the racist Zionist movement in Palestine and the *apartheid* movement in South Africa, which explains their attachment to each other and to their western origins.

46. On the basis of historical experience, we are confident that these movements and concepts will fade into oblivion.

47. We are confident that the media do not create civilization, that guns do not plant wheat and that racism is incompatible with human dignity. We are confident that the difficult conditions prevailing in the Middle East are merely transitory and that that region, which has given the world most of its civilized heritage, will recover its natural role in civilization.

48. The position of the United Arab Emirates is that any State that gives aid to Israel, either directly or indirectly, is a partner in Israel's crimes.

49. We believe that any initiatives, solutions or proposals that do not take into account the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and lead to the exercise of those rights, which include the right to return to their homeland and to establish their own independent State on their national soil, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the PLO, cannot provide a solid basis for a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

50. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): The tragedy of Palestine, the agony, the suffering and the unending injustice inflicted on the Palestinian people have been the subject of debate in the General Assembly for over three decades, ever since the inception of the United Nations. During this period, the membership of the United Nations has increased threefold and the principle of self-determination has been repeatedly vindicated and upheld, so that the process of decolonization is nearly completed. Yet, while so many of us have gained our independence and have been able to take our places here in the Assembly as sovereign independent States, the people of Palestine have yet to take their rightful place among us.

51. The stand of Cyprus on the question of Palestine is based on principle and is consistent. Our position stems from our firm belief in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; it is founded on an enduring commitment to the cause of oppressed peoples all over the world struggling to free themselves from the bondage of colonialism, aggression and exploitation.

52. The question of Palestine involves the life and the existence, the rights and the homeland of the Palestinian people.

53. Five million Palestinians remain deprived of the most elementary human rights. More than half of them live in other States of the world and some live as refugees in their own country.

54. The question of Palestine is a political problem. It concerns the struggle of the people for their inalienable national right to determine their own destiny. It is to be regretted that, despite the total and unflinching support extended by the majority of the international community, the aspirations of the Palestinian people have not yet been realized.

55. General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) clearly spells out the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determina-

tion, national independence and sovereignty and their right to return to the homes and property from which they have been forcibly evicted. That resolution also assures the right of the Palestinian people to present their own cause and participate in any peace negotiations through their sole, legitimate representative, the PLO.

56. At the outset of my statement today I referred to the fact that the question of Palestine was born after the establishment of the United Nations itself and has been a perennial item on its agenda since 1947. If we look at the negative side, we must say that the world Organization is unable to impose and implement its resolutions, achieve its objectives and fulfil the promises made to the peoples of the world. Looking at the positive side, one must emphasize the long period of time devoted by the United Nations to the discussion of the question of Palestine, a fact which clearly reflects the immense concern of the international community and its desire to bring to an end the suffering of the much-tormented Palestinian people. It also reflects the concern of the United Nations about the situation in the Middle East, where the question of Palestine forms the core of the conflict, a dangerous situation threatening the peace and security of the entire world. This persistence and this effort on the part of the international community and the United Nations to bring about a just solution of the question of Palestine deserve the greatest appreciation and interest.

57. We believe that any process intended to bring lasting peace to the Middle East which overlooks the Palestinian issue in its national aspect and its threefold claim of the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to independence will not bring forth positive results but, on the contrary, will have pernicious consequences in both the short and long term. It is our duty to follow the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of right and justice with regard to the pressing question of Palestine and the rights of the Palestinian people. Any straying from these principles would lead to the further undermining of the precepts of the United Nations and would contribute to loss of hope that finally peace and security can be restored to the region and to the world.

58. We wish to remind the Assembly that justice and right offer the only road to permanent peace and that straying from the path of peace will only cause a deterioration of the situation and increase exposure to the greatest dangers.

59. The non-aligned countries, including my own, have been faithfully and resolutely supporting the Palestinian struggle. We maintain that the solution for the Palestinian question should be sought within the United Nations framework and on the basis of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and decisions.

60. We feel that, in these trying days for the Palestinian people, it is necessary for the United Nations and the entire international community to intensify their efforts and take every measure to implement the decisions of the Security Council on the question of Palestine.

61. The Palestinian people, by their long struggle, have given a striking demonstration that a people seeking freedom, self-determination and independence will not remain alone and that those fighting for freedom are stronger than those imposing domination. It is hoped that at this late hour this cardinal truth will be realized by all and that peace and justice will finally be achieved for the friendly, neighbouring and much-tormented people of Palestine.

62. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Massamba Sarré, to introduce draft resolutions A/39/L.37 to L.40.

63. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*interpretation from French*): In the light of the very responsible debate we have had here, on the one hand, and the reports of the Secretary-General and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, on the other, the Committee would like to submit to the General Assembly for its consideration four draft resolutions [*A/39/L.37 to L.40*]. As representatives have noticed, the debate, like the accompanying reports, is both responsible and constructive. We have discerned a political will and an unreserved commitment to settle by peaceful means, as called for by the Charter of the United Nations, the Israeli-Arab conflict, which has been at the forefront of the international scene for some 40 years. On the basis of this rather encouraging sign, the draft resolutions before the Assembly emphasize the ways and means of achieving that noble objective, which should be the major concern of each and every State Member of the United Nations.

64. Draft resolution A/39/L.37 deals with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. In renewing that Committee's mandate, the Assembly would also request it to continue its efforts to promote the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, which are the prerequisite for the restoration of peace and stability in the Middle East. The Committee is also requested to make suggestions and recommendations both to the General Assembly and to the Security Council within the context of a peaceful settlement of the Palestinian question. Furthermore, the Committee is called upon to co-operate with non-governmental organizations, which continue to play an important part in dealing with this crisis.

65. Draft resolution A/39/L.38 notes with appreciation the measures taken by the Secretary-General to enhance the effectiveness of the Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat in conjunction with the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat. It invites Governments and organizations to lend their co-operation to the Committee, and it welcomes the action taken by Member States to observe annually, on 29 November, the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

66. Draft resolution A/39/L.39 deals with the Department of Public Information, which has done a remarkable piece of objective work to acquaint the world better with the rights of the Palestinian people. The Department is called upon to continue those efforts and intensify them, particularly by the organization of regional and national encounters for journalists.

67. Draft resolution A/39/L.40—which is the most important part of our work—deals with the international peace conference on the Middle East. As representatives know, after a number of years of thought and various approaches, the international community now realizes that the best way—indeed,

the only way—to settle the question of the Middle East is to organize an international conference involving the participation of all the parties concerned, as well as the Security Council in its capacity as the guarantor of international peace and security. Nothing should stand in the way of the convening of such a conference, provided that the rights and concerns of all the interested parties are safeguarded. Nothing should stand in its way because the right to existence of all States in the region is already a principle acknowledged by us all, ever since the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983.

68. It has been amply demonstrated in the case of the Israeli-Arab conflict, as in many similar cases, that the use of force was the worst possible way to try to settle a dispute; on the contrary, it tended to complicate it even further. Genuine peace can be found only around the negotiating table, and our duty is to encourage the parties to do this. Draft resolution A/39/L.40, while noting the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/130 and Add.1*], reaffirms the idea of convening such a conference. While deploring the attitude of two Governments—the first as a directly concerned party and the second as a member of the Security Council—the draft resolution calls upon them to reconsider their position. It also requests the Secretary-General to continue his efforts and urges Governments to make additional constructive efforts to convene the conference.

69. Criticisms, recriminations and a spirit of confrontation are not found in these draft resolutions. The Committee wanted them to be constructive, while taking account of international realities. In adopting them, the Assembly will have taken an important and decisive step towards the consolidation of international peace and security. By assisting in their speedy implementation, the States Members of the United Nations will have remained faithful to the Charter, by promoting peace and understanding among States and peoples.

70. Peace is beckoning; together, let us heed this call by adopting these draft resolutions with the solemn commitment to implement them without delay.

71. Mr. MOHIUDDIN (Bangladesh): The Assembly is once again considering the question of Palestine. Another year has passed, but this crucial problem still remains unresolved. It has been over a year since the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, adopted the Geneva Declaration on Palestine[4] and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[4] aimed at the successful resolution of the long-standing problem. It is with deep anguish and frustration that my delegation notes the apparent lack of progress during the preceding months. In fact, the situation has steadily deteriorated, and Israel during recent months has intensified its ruthless attempts to liquidate the Palestinian people and their sole and legitimate representative, the PLO. The Israeli policy of aggression, occupation and expansion has further aggravated an already explosive situation in the region, thereby threatening international peace and security. The question of Palestine, therefore, should be considered by this world body in its proper perspective as one of the utmost importance.

72. We have before us the latest report of the Secretary-General [*ibid.*] and the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*A/39/35*]. The reports are, as usual, balanced and objective. My delegation would like to put on record its deep gratitude to the Secretary-General and to the Chairman and other members of the Committee for their sincere endeavours and untiring efforts in the cause of Palestine.

73. My delegation has always emphasized that the question of Palestine is at the core of the problem of the Middle East and that it is not possible to envisage a settlement of the problems in the Middle East unless the legitimate and inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people are fully restored. We are equally convinced that any international effort to bring peace to the region must be based on a comprehensive solution of the problem. It was in this context that the President of Bangladesh, Lieutenant-General Hossain Mohammad Ershad, in his message on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, on 29 November 1984, stated:

> "The Government and the people of Bangladesh once again join with the international community in reiterating full and unswerving support to our Palestinian brethren in their just struggle for independence and the realization of their inalienable and legitimate right to establish a State of their own in their homeland, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, their sole and legitimate representative, with Jerusalem as their capital.
>
> "The question of Palestine is at the heart of the Middle East problem. It is a major challenge to the credibility of the international community in its efforts to uphold the principles and objectives enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. No other problem has evoked so much thought and unleashed such a high degree of indignation in recent times as this issue—the tragedy of a dispossessed nation.
>
> "The political entity of the Palestinian people and their right to establish a State of their own in their homeland is an established fact under international law and jurisprudence. To ignore this fact would be to discount a reality recognized by an overwhelming majority of the world's nation-States. The recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of a State of their own must be the fundamental element of any durable and lasting peace in the Middle East. Bangladesh has always taken a keen interest in and endeavoured to uphold the just cause of the Palestinian people in all international forums, especially the United Nations. From the very outset, Bangladesh has actively advocated the establishment of the rights of the Palestinian people as a nation."

74. Preceding speakers have already given an elaborate and graphic account of the volatile and explosive situation prevailing in the Middle East region today. They have also dwelt at length on how Israel, since its creation, has been pursuing a policy of relentless expansion and occupation directed against its Arab neighbours with a view to changing the Arab and Palestinian character of the occupied territories. Thousands of innocent people—men, women and children—have been massacred, but the Palestinian

people have once again demonstrated that they cannot be subjugated by violence and that their inalienable rights cannot be denied to them. It is a universally recognized fact that the question of Palestine is a political problem involving the right of people to national self-determination and their right to return to their homes and property from which they were forcibly evicted. The political entity of the Palestinian people and their right to establish a State of their own in their homeland is an established fact under international law and jurisprudence. The General Assembly, after a great deal of deliberation, accepted this fact a decade ago, and it has been repeatedly reaffirmed at all its succeeding sessions. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, also recognized this reality and adopted a comprehensive Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights.

75. Bangladesh's position on the question of Palestine stems from our firm belief in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and our deep commitment to the cause of oppressed peoples all over the world waging a just struggle to free themselves from the bondage of imperialism, colonialism and racism. We firmly adhere to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Bangladesh has repeatedly reaffirmed the right of all people to self-determination, freedom and independence, and our position on the question of Palestine has been based on the following four points: first, the question of Palestine is at the core of the problem of the Middle East and, consequently, it is not possible to envisage a solution of that problem unless one takes into account the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people; secondly, the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and to achieve self-determination, independence and national sovereignty must be realized and there must be genuine and greater understanding of the just cause of the Palestinian people; thirdly, the participation of the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing with all the other parties, on the basis of relevant General Assembly resolutions, is indispensable; and fourthly, the acquisition of territories by force is inadmissible, and Israel must totally withdraw from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories.

76. In the recent past, the United Nations has undertaken various efforts to bring justice to the Palestinian and Arab peoples, but these have been arrogantly and deliberately rejected by Israel, which openly flouts the decisions of the international community. Despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, Israel has refused to vacate the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. The developments in the Middle East during the past four decades have clearly emphasized the need for concerted international action, under the auspices of the United Nations, with a view to evolving a just, viable and lasting settlement of the problem. My delegation, therefore, attaches particular importance to the early convening of the proposed international conference on peace in the Middle East. We fully appreciate the Secretary-General's current initiative to that end and support his views, as stated in his report on the situation in the Middle East:

> "a comprehensive settlement will have to be reached, at least in its final stage, if not earlier, through a process of negotiation in which all the parties concerned will participate. In addition, it is generally recognized that the support of the major Powers, especially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, is essential for any lasting settlement in the Middle East. From a purely rational point of view, all these requirements could best and most readily be met if negotiations were undertaken under some form of United Nations auspices." [*See A/39/600, para. 39.*]

77. My delegation fully supports the Arab peace plan, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[1] as a sound basis for a comprehensive solution of the problem, and other plans which have been submitted by various parties are already before the international community. A particularly heavy responsibility rests with the permanent members of the Security Council. It is our earnest hope that, on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, a greater and more determined effort will be undertaken to resolve the question of Palestine, on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, with a view to restoring, finally, peace in the Middle East.

78. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): Today, 10 December, we commemorate the thirty-sixth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I ask the following question: What is the situation with respect to the rights of the Palestinian people? The reply is certainly disheartening, for, since 1956—that is, since the Palestinian resistance began to organize in order to press for its rights to self-determination, to sovereignty and to a homeland—things have not changed. On the contrary, as the years have gone by we have witnessed only a progressive hardening of the Israeli attitude, on the one hand, and a sort of plot to liquidate the Palestinian people's struggle, on the other.

79. The facts speak for themselves. In the land of Palestine, and the occupied territories in particular, in order to install its own citizens, Israel has deported Palestinians from their homes to inhospitable places, thereby splitting up families and destroying the remnants of their history and culture. Thus, the identity of the Palestinian people is being gradually threatened with annihilation because of this ongoing settlement operation, which has been of concern to the General Assembly and the very principle of which has been condemned by the international community.

80. The Palestinian refugee camps in the occupied territories are constantly harassed. Those Palestinian refugees who have found sanctuary in neighbouring Arab lands are pursued by the Israeli army or commandos, if they are not savagely massacred—and we all remember the horrible events in 1982 in the Sabra and Shatila camps in Lebanon, that other Arab country which is in part occupied by the Israeli army. The Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[5] must be respected by Israel in the occupied territories.

81. Without land and without respite even where it has found refuge, the Palestinian people is condemned to the status of virtual nomads. The memory

is still fresh in our minds of the exodus from Lebanon of thousands of Palestinians, evacuated in order to remove them from the battlefield. It is indeed an unhappy fate that has been meted out to the Palestinian people, which is only seeking, like all other peoples of the world, to exercise its right to self-determination in its own land, Palestine, in order to be able to set up there the political institutions of its choice and to live in peace.

82. There appears to be a wide-reaching conspiracy to liquidate the Palestinian resistance, of which the PLO is the spearhead. The purpose of this conspiracy is perfectly clear: to make us forget the Palestine problem. Many methods are used for this purpose, including the sowing of internal dissension within the resistance, in accordance with the old saw of "divide and rule".

83. All the efforts to preserve solidarity within the Palestinian resistance should be supported, because if we were to allow ourselves to be outmanoeuvred by internal or external conspiracies against the resistance, we should be playing into the hands of those who fish in troubled waters, and the noble struggle of the Palestinians—noble because it is just—would simply cease because there would no longer be anyone to wage it. That would be tragic for a people that seeks only to enjoy its fundamental, sovereign rights on its own land, like all peoples of the world.

84. The struggle of the Palestinian people is also the struggle of all those who believe in the right of peoples to self-determination and sovereignty. Hence, it is our struggle. That is why I take this opportunity to express again the total support of the Government of Rwanda for the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. In this connection, I wish to recall the statement made from this rostrum by Mr. François Ngarukiyintwali, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Rwanda, on 9 October last:

> "The rejection of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the occupation of Arab territories, the annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem, an aggressive policy in constant defiance of the principles of international law—these are some aspects of a continuing crisis which the United Nations constantly deplores, a crisis that is the responsibility of one State that has not drawn the lessons of its own history and has therefore become an implacable and unyielding enemy of a people fighting for the recognition of its most elementary and fundamental rights." [*26th meeting, para. 45.*]

85. But, after all, where can we find the solution? In the total and prompt implementation of United Nations resolutions on the Palestine problem, which is the core of the Middle East problem as a whole. Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) are the foundation on which a solution to the problem must be based. Unfortunately, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the parties concerned have taken exception to this. But not a single step towards a solution can be taken if some minimum common ground of agreement is not reached. These resolutions do contain the essential elements for a just and equitable solution. Hence, my delegation appeals to all the parties concerned to abide by them, each in its own specific sphere.

86. An international peace conference on the Middle East, the principle of which was proposed by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, and endorsed by the General Assembly, would provide an appropriate framework for the discussion of all these problems, with the participation of all the parties concerned: Israel, the PLO and the Arab countries of the region. All the members of the Security Council should also participate in the conference.

87. This comprehensive approach will, it is to be hoped, make it possible to untangle the problem of the Middle East in general and that of Palestine in particular, for, unless that is done, the Middle East will remain a region of confrontation and instability. That is why the international community, despite the failures of the past, must continue its efforts to ensure the triumph of the principles in which it believes: recognition of, and respect for, the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people, including

> "the right to its own homeland, in which it may establish the institutional and governmental structures of its own choice, with respect for . . . international law, under the auspices of its legitimate and authentic representatives" [*ibid., para. 46*]—that is, the PLO.

88. The reports of the Secretary-General and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People are clear; they reveal very disturbing incidents and facts. My delegation endorses the recommendations of those reports and gives its full support to the four draft resolutions on the question of Palestine. We congratulate the Committee, and particularly its Chairman, the dynamic Ambassador of Senegal, Mr. Massamba Sarré.

89. Since most of what needs to be said has already been said, and a number of appeals have been made, in particular, to those countries that hold the key to solving the problem of the Middle East, I shall conclude now by adding Rwanda's urgent appeal to those already made, convinced that one day justice will be done to all the peoples of the Middle East, and particularly the Palestinian people.

90. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In our recent statements at the current session of the Assembly during the debates on *apartheid* and Namibia, my delegation has spoken of the blame attaching to the United States for the suffering of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, because of its direct support for, and links with, the racist régime of South Africa. Today, as we face a similar situation in considering the question of Palestine, we cannot but state once again that it is the United States, with its strategic alliance with Israel, that is really responsible for the sufferings of the Palestinian people, which continues to be denied the right to its own State on its own soil.

91. In the final analysis, the suffering of the Palestinian people, the denial of its fundamental rights, the massacres of which it has been the victim throughout its history, are consequences of policies of force, of imperialist policies of the United States in the Middle East. Those policies form part of a whole, an integrated global policy based on the interests that the United States shares with its allies throughout the world. Among those allies we should mention in particular Israel in the Middle East; the Pretoria régime in southern Africa; and El Salvador and Honduras in Central America.

92. In its edition of 2 December, the American newspaper *Los Angeles Times* published an interview with the United States representative to the United

Nations. Asked about the lessons she had learned from her experience at the United Nations with regard to attitudes to Israel, she said:

> "With regard to Israel, I actually did not know until I came to the United Nations about the scope and intensity of hostility toward that nation. It is extraordinary. I frankly had no idea of the degree to which the so-called moderate Arabs are willing to say, for example, pejorative things about the honour and legitimacy of Israel. Analogies between the Nazis and the Israelis are practically a daily affair at the United Nations. It happens all the time: accusations against Israel of genocide, contempt for the idea that there is law in Israel, that there is honour in Israel, or that there is any legitimacy about Israel. There is a willingness to believe anything about Israel, no matter how atrocious."

93. Mrs. Kirkpatrick is thus trying to give American public opinion the impression that the United Nations is taking up subjective positions unrelated to reality, unrelated to the true nature and behaviour of Israel, a view we do not share and cannot accept. The truth is that, unlike the vast majority of Members of the United Nations, the United States turns its back on and disregards the factual information about Israel, because that information is incompatible with its predetermined and decided policy of unconditional support for the Zionist régime. Here it is worth looking at some examples. Let us recall the massacres of Sabra and Shatila. Let us speak about human rights, where there is every kind of evidence of Israeli violations. In that respect, the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [*A/39/591*] is more than conclusive. Because Israel has not co-operated with that Committee, much of the information in the report is based on exposés appearing in reports in the newspapers of Israel itself.

94. As a corollary to that, with respect to human rights, we must point out that that attitude of the United States is consistent with its overall policy of concealing and denying abuses by its friends and protegés in various regions of the world.

95. On 14 May of this year, in reply to a letter of 9 March from the Secretary-General to all members of the Security Council, my Government reiterated its full support for the holding of a peace conference on the Middle East [*see A/39/259*].

96. We wish to reiterate today our support for holding the conference under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation on an equal footing of the PLO, the United States, the Soviet Union and other interested States, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/58 C.

97. In supporting the holding of the conference, Nicaragua again expresses its firm conviction that political solutions and not the use of force are the only way in which to resolve international conflicts, and that the United States and those that implement its policies must show the international community their acknowledgement of and respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

98. Unfortunately, the convening of this conference has met with a series of obstacles, among which the attitude of the United States is an important factor, reflecting as it does a complete lack of understanding of those problems and of the ways of solving them. The United States does not wish to understand that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East situation and that there will be no peace in that region of the world until a just and lasting solution is found, a solution which must be centred on the establishment of a Palestinian State in Palestine.

99. The present United States Administration, in keeping with its warmongering policy of seeking military solutions to problems, persists—as it does in Central America and in southern Africa—in erecting obstacles to and restraining serious efforts in the search for peace in the region. If this is not so and if our analysis is wrong, why, then, has the United States provided Israel with approximately $17 billion in military assistance since 1965, almost $3 billion last year alone? Why does the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council, veto that important body's resolutions in order to hinder, with respect to Israel, implementation of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations?

100. When speaking of the Palestinian people, we could expand at length on the long list of atrocities, suffering and death that people has suffered at the hands of zionism. We could speak of illegal settlements, massacres, torture, collective punishment and many other things. But there is one element that stands out: the displacement of an entire nation from its own land and homes, and the subsequent complete withdrawal of national rights from people who are considered foreigners in their own land.

101. That is why the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to establish its own State on its own land and the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes are essential elements in the consideration of this problem. The international community cannot and must not close its eyes to this massive violation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The members of the Security Council, particularly, must act in accordance with international commitments and struggle actively for the maintenance of peace and security in that vitally important area.

102. My delegation, which participates as an observer in the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, wishes to express its full support for the Committee's recommendations in its report [*A/39/35*] and its gratitude to Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, for the fine work the Committee has been doing under his chairmanship.

103. I could not conclude without reiterating the militant solidarity of the people and Government of Nicaragua with the Palestinian people and its sole legitimate representative, the PLO, which sooner rather than later, as the unquestionable vanguard movement of that heroic people, will lead it to final liberation.

104. We wish also to reiterate what we have said during past consideration of this question: that it is important to maintain the unity of the Arab nation and of the Palestinian people and its vanguard movement, the PLO. Failure to do this will benefit only the enemy of the Arab nation and the Palestinian people, that is, the United States and its allies in the region.

105. Our revolution, which also waged a victorious war of liberation against the same enemy and its allies, knows how important it is to preserve, at any

cost, the unity of revolutionary forces, for that element played a decisive role in our final victory.

106. Moreover, it is important that we should not forget the lessons of history and remember that it was division among the revolutionary forces that led to the United States intervention, in its so-called "Operation Rescue", against the small island of Grenada barely one year ago.

107. Mr. TAHINDRO (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): For several years, it has been clear to the majority of the international community that the enjoyment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights is the *sine qua non* for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The following facts—also a matter of agreement among the international community—follow from that conclusion.

108. First, the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East problem; thus, no solution can be found unless it takes into account the legitimate, inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

109. Secondly, the attainment by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights to return to their homeland and to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty will help resolve the crisis in that region.

110. Thirdly, it is indispensable that the PLO, the sole and unique representative of the Palestinian people, should participate in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East, on an equal footing with all the other parties, in keeping with General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3375 (XXX).

111. Fourthly, the acquisition of territory by force is impermissible. It is thus imperative that Israel must withdraw unconditionally from all occupied Palestinian Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

112. These views have been constantly stated by such intergovernmental organizations as the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, as well as by the States Members of the United Nations.

113. We wish in this connection to recall the Final Communiqué adopted by the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984 [*see A/39/560*]. The participants reaffirmed their total support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and their determination to act for early achievement of those rights.

114. Similarly, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at its twentieth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, adopted a resolution in which it vigorously condemned all initiatives, measures and agreements that did not take into account the aspirations of the Palestinian people and its sole authentic representative, the PLO, and considered that any agreement on the question of Palestine entered into without the participation of the PLO was null and void.[6]

115. Moreover, the Fourth Islamic Summit Conference, held at Casablanca from 16 to 19 January 1984, adopted several resolutions on the question of Palestine [*see A/39/131 and Corr.1*] in which it recognized that a just peace can be established in the region only with the total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all occupied Arab territories and with the restoration to the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights.

116. To conclude this brief survey designed to illustrate the international consensus on the question of Palestine, we would draw attention to the fact that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the ten States members of the European Economic Community, meeting at Brussels on 27 March 1984, emphasized in their declaration on the Middle East[7] that any settlement should take into account the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

117. It is disturbing to note, however, that despite this general consensus on the way in which the question of Palestine should be solved, Israel, in violation of numerous resolutions of the United Nations and of international treaties to which it is a party, continues to violate the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and to pursue its policy of occupying Palestinian and Arab territories, as well as its illegal establishment of Jewish settlements in occupied Palestinian territories, particularly by the confiscation of lands belonging to Arabs and by the systematic and repeated violation of the human rights of the populations in the occupied territories.

118. Thus, according to the most recent information from the occupied territories, the Israeli authorities, in an announcement dated 30 October 1984, are said to be planning to construct a further settlement in Halhul, after expelling 24 Palestinian families. On 28 October, Jewish terrorists attacked a bus transporting some Arabs, killing one passenger and wounding 11 others. In addition, we should note in passing the persistent harassment of the Left Bank universities, the imprisonment of Palestinians without warrant, the shooting on sight of Arab inhabitants by Jewish settlers and Israeli soldiers, the detention of nationalists, including the former Mayor of Nablus, and the profanation of mosques, including the Ibrahimi Mosque in Hebron.

119. Such Israeli practices are of course not only in flagrant violation of international law and of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[5] but also contrary to the spirit and the letter of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. What is even more serious is that it appears that the Israeli Government intends to pursue its policy of establishing additional settlements in the occupied territories so that, according to forecasts, their population will reach the minimum figure of 100,000 Israeli settlers by 1987 and 190,000 by 2010.

120. In the face of these disturbing prospects, we feel it is the duty of States with any decisive influence on Israel to recall it to reason and make it understand that its present military superiority is no more than ephemeral and that, in addition, the peace of the tomb of which it is today the apostle cannot replace lasting peace based on justice in the Middle East.

121. On the strength of those principles, we are pleased to endorse the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, which welcomed the call for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East in conformity with the following guidelines: first, the enjoyment by the Palestinian people of its legitimate and inalienable rights, including the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish its own

independent State in Palestine; secondly, recognition of the right of the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing with other parties in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East; thirdly, the need to put an end to Israel's occupation of the Arab territories, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and, consequently, the need to secure Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem; fourthly, the need to oppose and reject all Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and any *de facto* situation created by Israel which are contrary to international law and relevant United Nations resolutions—particularly the settlements policy—since these constitute major obstacles to the achievement of peace in the Middle East; fifthly, the need to declare null and void all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which have altered or are intended to alter the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, including the expropriation of land and property situated thereon, and in particular the so-called "Basic Law" on Jerusalem and the proclamation of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel; and, lastly, the right of all States in the region to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, with justice and security for all, the *sine qua non* of which is the recognition and exercise of the inalienable, legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

122. We also believe that all the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO and the two great Powers and other States concerned, should participate in the international peace conference on an equal footing and with equal rights. To that end, we call upon certain States that are still against the convening of that conference to reconsider their position and thus make possible just and lasting peace in the region.

123. The commitment of the people of Madagascar to the Palestinian cause is a matter of public record. The Democratic Republic of Madagascar has always been convinced that the question of Palestine is the crux of the Middle East problem and that there can be no question of any kind of separate peace, any agreement that does not take due account of the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people, or any arrangement concluded without the participation of the PLO.

124. That is why we welcomed the meeting of the Palestine National Council at Amman last month. The very fact that that meeting was held demonstrated, if there were any need to do so, the vigour of that Palestinian legislative body, which, furthermore, reiterated its confidence in the present leadership of the PLO.

125. We cannot conclude this statement without reaffirming our support for the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which, under the chairmanship of Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, has always discharged its mandate in a diligent and devoted manner. Lastly, we are once again convinced that the majority of the States represented in this forum share the feelings of the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, when he stated in his message of solidarity with and support for the Palestinian people on the occasion of the commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People: "What the PLO wants, we want as well, and Palestine will be victorious."

126. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In the course of the General Assembly's consideration of the question of Palestine, which lies at the heart of the conflict in the Middle East, it should be recalled that the question of Palestine was not born on 5 June 1967, when Israel attacked three Arab States and occupied all of Palestine, the Syrian Golan Heights and other parts of the Arab nation. Indeed, this question was created with the arrival of the first influx of settlers, in implementation of the Basel programme adopted at the first world Zionist Congress in 1897. Then the imperialist States gave their blessings to the scheme in their scramble to partition the Middle East, before, during and after the First World War.

Mr. Fajardo Maldonado (Guatemala), Vice-President, took the Chair.

127. The Basel programme, which is the definitive foundation of the colonization of Palestine, is based on two principles: first, the Judaization of the land, that is to say, the usurpation of the land of Arabs; and, secondly, the Judaization of labour, which means depriving the Arabs of the right to work in their own homeland, Palestine, and the creation of an exclusively Jewish society. As to the size of the land to be so colonized, it was determined on the basis of an admixture of secular colonialism and colonialism emanating from Jewish mythology. Then there was the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the mandate system, which was invented by that genius of contemporary imperialism, Jan Smuts, of South Africa, and which opened the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration. This indeed marked the beginning of the inevitable Arab struggle against aggression and for the defence of Arab rights, especially the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

128. The history of Palestine since 1919 is the history of a people struggling, with all possible means, to restore its legitimate rights. The problem of Palestine has taken its present international shape since 1947, when Palestine was partitioned by a resolution contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of contemporary international law. Then the Arab nation came to the rescue of the Palestinian people against Zionist aggression, which has been aimed since then at the occupation of the whole of Palestine by brute force and massacres, such as the massacre of Deir Yassin in 1948. Israel has always sought to justify its continued aggression. At times it invokes the will of God, at others it tries to rewrite history in order to obliterate the Arab Islamic and Christian history in Palestine. At still other times, it invokes considerations of absolute security, even though we know that in this world there is no absolute security for any State. As I have already stated, the core of the conflict is that aggression that is being committed against the Arab people of Palestine and that has now spread to other neighbouring Arab countries, in order to establish a colonial State.

129. We should recall the racist character of that State called "Israel", in order to understand the tragedy of the Arabs in Palestine. The Zionist ideology, which is the source of inspiration for the racist and expansionist Israeli practices, has no counterpart in contemporary history except in nazism, which has been overcome, and in *apartheid,*

which will shortly be overcome. In resolution 3379 (XXX), entitled "Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination", the General Assembly determined that "zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination". That resolution is a historic turning-point in the international community's understanding of Zionist racism. It is regrettable, however, that, under pressure by some imperialist circles, the General Assembly has not been able to translate that resolution into international action to eliminate racism all over the world, in order to deter Israel from persisting in its racist policies, which endanger international peace and security in a manner similar to the policies of *apartheid* in southern Africa and which also constitute a gross violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[5] In its 1979 report, the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories referred to the racist Israeli policies in the following terms:

> "Israel's policy in the occupied territories is based on the so-called 'homeland' doctrine which envisages a mono-religious (Jewish) State established on territory that includes those territories occupied by Israel in June 1967."[8]

130. The Special Committee concluded that:

> "to the extent that the inhabitants of the occupied territories do not form part of the religious group in whose name the Government of Israel claims the right to establish itself, these inhabitants have no rights *vis-à-vis* the governing authorities (in this case the Government of Israel as a military occupation authority) whenever the exercise of these rights happens to run counter to the 'homeland' policy."[9]

131. The Special Committee also concluded that such a doctrine could not but negate the right of the Arab citizen to return to his homeland and declared that:

> "Therefore, the Government of Israel, assisted by the judicial authorities, continues to deny the right to return to their homes to those inhabitants of the occupied territories who fled as a result of the hostilities and to those expelled by the Israeli military authorities from the occupied territories since June 1967."[9]

132. That doctrine, manifested in Israeli racist practices, negates the existence of the Arabs and makes Israel, like South Africa, an entity which endangers a world order based on values, principles and laws—values, principles and laws which neither Israel nor South Africa can respect because of an inherent natal defect common to both of them. Israel is based on a denial of the existence of the Arabs, on non-recognition of their rights and on contempt for anything that does not belong to zionism.

133. That contempt towards Arabs—even towards oriental Jews—was expressed by Ben-Gurion, when he said, as quoted in *The Fate of the Jews*, by Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht:[10]

> "We do not want Israelis to become Arabs. We are duty-bound to fight against the spirit of the Levant, which corrupts individuals and societies, and to preserve the authentic Jewish values as they are crystallized in the Diaspora."[*]

134. Abba Eban, the former Israeli Foreign Minister, who can now be seen on American television's Channel 13 in an attempt to sell the history of Judaism—a misleading matter—to the American society and who is called an intellectual, has said:

> "One of the great apprehensions that afflicts us when we contemplate our cultural scene is the fear that the predominance of immigrants of oriental origin may force Israel to equalize its cultural level with that of the neighbouring world."[*]

135. The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that the Israeli colonialist society is by its nature, inclination and goals based on a refusal to recognize the existence of the Arabs and on hatred of the people of Palestine. Consequently, it is a régime which is against a just peace. The General Assembly, which heard the statement of the Israeli representative during the debate on the Middle East [*72nd meeting*], must ask itself these questions. Who wants to eliminate whom? Who has eliminated the Arab existence? Who seeks a just peace? Who is profiting from aggression? The present Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs and former head of the Stern Gang, Mr. Shamir, has said: "We want peace, but only in conditions which will enable us to continue to exist, and this means the Golan Heights, Judea and Samaria within the boundaries of the land of Israel."[*]

136. Moreover, Mordechai Zipori, the former Israeli Minister of Communications, has declared: "The Golan Heights is ours and anybody who regards himself as a Syrian should be allowed in a democratic fashion to move to Syria."[*]

137. I should like to draw the attention of those who claim that Israel is the representative of democracy in our region—and this includes the delegation of the United States—to those words: "anybody who regards himself as a Syrian should be allowed in a democratic fashion to move to Syria."[*]

138. This is the democracy in which they believe, the democracy of occupation.

139. We always insist, in the General Assembly, on one thing: that the Assembly should see the peace proclaimed by Israel in the light of the declarations of its leaders, for their peace is the peace of the graveyard. That is why we ask that Israel be evaluated on the basis of its aggression, its deep-seated racism, its policy of colonialism and expansionism that runs against the current of the peaceful international relations called for by the Charter of the United Nations and against the sanctity of human rights.

140. On the basis of these considerations, the General Assembly adopted in 1982, at its ninth emergency special session, resolution ES-9/1, concerning Israel's violation of its obligations and of the Charter, in which it declared—a declaration reaffirmed in successive resolutions of the Assembly—that:

> "Israel's record and actions confirm that it is not a peace-loving Member State and that it has carried out neither its obligations under the Charter nor its commitment under General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949".

141. We believe that the General Assembly should once again reaffirm that declaration, the validity of which was proved this year when Israel and its partner, the United States, rejected the idea of an international peace conference on the Middle East, which was endorsed by the General Assembly in

---

[*] Quoted in English by the speaker.

resolution 38/58 C. That shameful refusal is referred to in the Secretary-General's report to both the General Assembly and the Security Council [*A/39/130/Add.1*]. That report cites the response of the United States and Israel to the idea of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East: "it is clear from the replies of the Governments of Israel and the United States of America that they are not prepared to participate in the proposed conference."

142. The Israeli colonialist society, which is based on the ashes of the Palestinian people and the continuance of the settlements policy in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, cannot, because of its racist, terrorist nature, accept the principle of a just peace based on resolutions of the United Nations, which recognize, affirm and guarantee the right of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland, to self-determination without foreign intervention and to establish its own independent State on its national soil and which call for unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all the territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

143. Israel has defied the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Secretary-General, and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People when it rejected the idea of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East. Israel would like a new Camp David, because the Camp David accords were based on depriving the Palestinian people of its national rights. Those accords encouraged Israel to annex land by creating new *faits accomplis.* It promised the Palestinians administrative autonomy covering individuals but not their lands, their farms or their waters. This is what Israel wants from the Arabs.

144. Israel dictates what it wants to Washington, which in the same spirit rejects the idea of convening a peace conference in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. It is continuing to worship the structure erected following the Camp David accords on the remains of Arab Palestine in order to deal with the Arabs individually and to force them to shameful surrender.

145. Israel would not have been able to defy the international community by refusing to participate in an international peace conference, and would not have been able to persist in its aggressive and expansionist practices, annexing the Golan Heights and Jerusalem, without the unlimited diplomatic, political, military and economic support it receives from the United States. The November 1981 strategic co-operation agreement between Washington and Tel Aviv has widened and become a strategic alliance in the full sense of the word, an alliance directed against the interests of the Arab nation and its right to live in peace. It is an alliance that endangers international peace and security in the region and beyond.

146. United States support for Israel has known no limits, including aiding Israel in its wars against the Arabs, especially the June 1967 war. In his book entitled *Taking Sides: America's secret relations with a militant Israel,*[11] Stephen Green states the following:

> "There were forms of material assistance required by Israel. On May 23, Johnson authorized an emergency air shipment of armoured personnel carriers, tank spare parts, spare parts for the Hawk missile air defense system, bomb fuses, artillery ammunition and gas masks, among many other items. These items were packed and sent just prior to the June 5 invasion, in preparation for it, at a time when President Johnson had publicly declared an arms embargo on all items going to the Middle East. One almost wonders whether there might not have been two Lyndon Johnsons in the White House in early June 1967."*

147. As to the collusion between Washington and Israel in the latest war against Lebanon, some facts have started to surface. In a book published by two Israeli writers, Ze'ev Schiff and Ehud Ya-ahir, entitled *Israel's Lebanon War,*[12] there is a reference to a message by the butcher Sharon to his friend Alexander Haig, in which he said:

> "I have just now returned from one of my visits to our troops in Lebanon. I want to tell you that in the 'Peace for Galilee' operation the IDF has brilliantly achieved all its missions, as instructed by the Government. We have succeeded in eliminating the huge PLO terrorist military infrastructure in southern Lebanon and we are now encircling the bases of terrorism and its headquarters in Beirut itself. In the course of the operation, faced with a Syrian decision to interfere in the air and on the ground, we also succeeded in breaking the strategic hold of the Syrian Army in Lebanon, which had provided a massive support to PLO terrorism.
>
> "On that background, I wish to express to you my deep appreciation for your understanding and your determined stand in the struggle against international terrorism . . . You are entitled, Mr. Secretary, to be proud of your achievements."*

148. Regarding the 1982 aggression against Lebanon, the two above-mentioned journalists compared the role of Washington in the previous Israeli wars against the Arabs and its role during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, saying: "Neither in the Yom Kippur War nor in the Six-Day War before it had Israel enjoyed such heartening understanding from Washington."*

149. On previous occasions, my delegation has spoken in the General Assembly on the staggering amounts of assistance Israel receives from the American Administration in the form of grants, showing that each Israeli gets about $1,000 per year, a figure that is expected to reach $3,000 in 1986. At this very moment, there are joint American-Israeli committees working in complete secrecy to develop all aspects of the strategic alliance between the two countries. In addition, in the second part of its ninety-eighth session, the United States Congress enacted law No. 5377, which authorizes the President of the United States to conclude a commercial agreement with Israel granting it full customs exemption and exemption from restrictions on Israeli products. The Executive Director of the so-called American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, which is the expression of the Zionist lobby in the Congress, on 22 May 1984 produced written testimony to the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress, in which he explained the reason for calling for the creation of a free market between the United States and Israel.

150. I shall quote the following passage from that written testimony:

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

"Israel has great strategic importance for the United States and the West. Its important geographic location in the Mediterranean and in the heart of the Middle East, in addition to the fighting capability of its armed forces and its commitment against the Soviet Union, makes Israel a strategic ally of great importance to that sensitive region of the world. Israel's power helps achieve United States interests."

151. It can be concluded from that testimony that Israeli occupation and its wars against the Arabs would not have been possible without the unlimited support given by the United States to Israel in many areas. It is in the nature of things that the development of the strategic alliance between the two countries through pooling their two markets will make available to Israel all the financial and economic capabilities of the United States, enabling it to commit more acts of aggression and to seek to impose its hegemony over the Middle East.

152. The Zionist lobby was successful in imposing its will on the American economy, inducing that economy to serve its aggressive policies and help to continue its occupation of other parts of Arab land on the pretext of a bogus threat, which in fact does not exist, and causing the American people to overlook the brutal Israeli occupation which is undemocratic, colonialist and racist. In fact, the American taxpayer is bearing the cost of the Israeli occupation in the West Bank, Gaza, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. Yet, there are some in Arab and other circles that still believe it is possible to change the feelings of the United States towards them and their national causes.

153. We believe that the General Assembly should reaffirm its resolutions calling for the termination of dealings with Israel in the diplomatic, economic, financial and military fields, because such dealings—at a time when Israel defies the international community by rejecting General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, and even the idea of an international peace conference on the Middle East, in accordance with United Nations resolutions and under the auspices of the international Organization, to ensure Israel's withdrawal from all the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967 and recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland, to exercise self-determination and to establish an independent State on its national soil—such dealings encourage Israel to develop its capabilities aimed at establishing the "Greater Israel" which would extend from the Nile to the Euphrates. In fact, Israel's goals are contrary to those of the United Nations. As a result of the Camp David accords, Israel escalated its settlements policy by assuming control of 60 per cent of the land in the West Bank. Since 1967, it has established 160 settlements in the West Bank, 19 in the Gaza Strip and 41 in the Golan Heights. Israel is still working hard to settle 100,000 Jews in the occupied areas by 1985. At the same time, Israel continues to violate human rights in the occupied Arab territories. Those violations are serious, and very few deny that they are similar to Nazi practices. Israel practises terror, murder, arbitrary arrest, collective punishment, demolition of Arab houses, expulsion, deportation, and expropriation of lands and of water resources. Moreover, Israel undermines the economic and social infrastructures, closes universities and schools, punishes teachers and students. Such practices occur daily. The Palestinian child is killed or punished just for raising the Palestinian flag. Students are shot for demonstrating to express their true nationalist feelings and Arab identity. No other people in the world is subjected to such forms of terror and repression.

154. Moreover, the Israeli occupation authorities are undertaking excavations and other works in the holy places, including Jerusalem. The General Assembly should therefore take appropriate measures to deter Israel—deter that Israel which the United States has tried to project as an "island of democracy"—from these practices. In addition, the Assembly should enhance the work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. That committee's work is most important in order to increase the international community's awareness of the situation and make that community understand the actual practices taking place in the occupied territories. International justice, which punished the Nazi criminals, must also punish the criminals of the terrorist and colonialist "island of democracy".

155. We should like to repeat very clearly to the United States what my delegation has already said in the general debate, namely, that its insistence on finding a solution to the problem of the Middle East and the question of Palestine on the basis of the Camp David accords, or similar types of agreement based on partial and separate arrangements, can lead only to an exacerbation of tension in the region and will only make the situation more explosive. Also, such a stand has enabled Israel to intensify its settlements policy in the occupied Arab lands and has given it a free hand to strike in all directions. Thus it has declared the annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights and it has occupied Lebanon and continues to occupy large areas of that country. All such practices undermine the role of the United Nations, which is based on international legality.

156. My delegation would like to quote from the message from the President of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, as follows:

"For us in Syria, the cause of the Palestinian people is a fundamental cause and is at the heart of our struggle against aggression and occupation and for peace and justice.

"The Palestinian lands are part of the Arab nation; indeed, they are the very heart of the Arab nation. The people of Palestine are part of the Arab nation. Therefore, aggression against the Palestinian people is aggression against the Arab nation. It is the beginning of the Israeli expansionist scheme aimed at the establishment of a greater Israeli State extending from the Nile to the Euphrates."

157. The General Assembly, which has consistently shown that it understands the nature of the fight waged against us since our independence and has supported our people in Palestine, must fulfil at this session the great responsibility entrusted to it under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Consequently, it must spare no effort to enable the Arab people of Palestine to recover its full rights in accordance with international law, of which the United Nations is the custodian.

158. In conclusion, I should like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the

Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and especially to Mr. Sarré, its Chairman. Its report [*A/39/35*] has met with the approval of all because of its frankness and objectivity and the completeness of its description of the activities of the Committee in carrying out its important task.

159. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia): This year my delegation is addressing the General Assembly almost at the end of its deliberations on a longstanding and extraordinarily dangerous international problem. This allows us to make a broader statistical survey of the development of the debate. Israel has been unambiguously marked as an aggressor carrying out an illegal occupation, seeking expansionist aims, ignoring the norms of international law and the decisions of the United Nations, pursuing a policy of annexation and disregarding fundamental human rights. The United States, because of its all-round assistance to Israel, has been declared Israel's accomplice. A particularly significant feature of the debate has been the unity of views on the rights of the Arab people of Palestine. This unity of the Members of the United Nations provides notable support for effective action by the Arab people of Palestine in their struggle for their legitimate rights.

160. The position of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on this question is in full harmony with the attitude of the international community. This position was reaffirmed on 29 November 1984, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, by the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in his message of greeting to the PLO. The message states, among other things, that the Czechoslovak people resolutely condemn the expansionist policy of Israel, backed by United States imperialism, and fully support the Palestinian people, headed by their sole legitimate representative, the PLO, in their struggle for the realization of their inalienable right to self-determination and to the establishment of their own independent State.

161. The Czechoslovak delegation shares the serious concerns of many other delegations about the dangerous chauvinistic logic of the ruling circles of Israel. Although those rulers talk a great deal about the right of Israel to an independent and secure existence, they are not willing to recognize the same rights in respect of the Palestinian people. Israel uses the illegal occupation of the Arab territories for its predatory aims. It maintains and fans tensions in the Middle East region and persecutes the Arab people of Palestine in the territories of other States also, thus violating the sovereignty of those States.

162. What are the root causes of this state of affairs? The present crisis situation has been created as a result and component of an extensive attack on progressive development in the Arab world. Israel's ruling class plays in this attack the role of a striking force, while at the same time also pursuing its own selfish goals.

163. Therefore, the Middle East crisis is not only a clash between the Zionist forces at present ruling in Israel and the Arab people; it is a conflict between the Arab national liberation movement and one of the forms or branches of world imperialism, unreservedly supported by the anti-people imperialist circles in the United States. On analysing the developments in the Middle East, we have to state, much to our regret, that the approach of the United States Administration, representing these imperialist circles, has been developing in a more and more negative way. This has given Israel a free hand for the implementation of its Zionist plans directed against the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, and Israel is taking advantage of it. It is disregarding all norms of international law, ignoring the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and trampling upon the ideals cherished by the United Nations, of which Israel is still a Member. Its policy has only one aim: the so-called final settlement of the Palestinian question as proposed by Herzl, the founding father of zionism.

164. An integral part of this concept is constituted by the massacres at Sabra and Shatila, which in their nature resemble the crimes committed by the Fascists at Coventry, Rotterdam, Warsaw and Lidice and in the Soviet Union, as well as those perpetrated later in My Lai. The world has not yet healed the wounds of Sabra and Shatila, and yet Israel is committing new crimes.

165. The greatest obstacle to the Israeli policy of annexation is the systematic resistance of the Palestinian people, headed by its only legitimate representative, the PLO. That is why the barbaric attack carried out by Israel against Lebanon in 1982 was directed primarily to the liquidation of that organization and the entire Palestinian resistance movement.

166. The number of acts committed by Israel which deserve condemnation is large. Much has been said about them in this forum. In the interest of the further stabilization of our efforts, I would like to mention here the statement by an Israeli lawyer, Felicia Langer, that she felt how weak and vague all words were when confronted with the tragic reality.

167. The international community and all its members must actively contribute to the establishment of an equitable position for the Arab people of Palestine. That is why we again express appreciation of the conclusions adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[1] which established prerequisites favourable for the solution of the Palestine question.

168. A compass for the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East, including a just settlement of the Palestine question, is provided by the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union on 15 September 1982.[3] We fully support also the latest Soviet proposals [*see A/39/368*], which reflect the justified desires of the Arab people of Palestine to put an end to the Israeli occupation and to do away with its consequences in all the occupied Palestinian territories. They offer the Palestinians a possibility of implementing their right to self-determination and to the establishment of their own State, while demanding the effective safeguarding of the right of all States in the region to security and an independent existence and development, based on compliance with the principle of full reciprocity.

169. Historical experience teaches us to reject attempts to influence the developments in the Middle East such as the Kissinger step-by-step policy, the Camp David accords and the Reagan plan of 1 September 1982.[2]

170. It is only natural that the main decisions must be made by the Arab people of Palestine. We are confident that, in spite of the temporary weakening of the unity of the Palestinian nation caused by

Israel's aggression, the cohesion of its struggle for its legitimate rights will be restored.

171. Czechoslovakia regards the PLO as the representative of a sovereign and independent nation and gives full support to its just struggle. The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic decided last year to grant the PLO agency in Prague the status of a diplomatic mission.

172. The PLO was founded 20 years ago. During the period of its existence, it has proved its viability in managing the affairs of the Arab people of Palestine. It is therefore impossible to separate the Palestinians from the PLO, as is done by Israel and the United States. Those who are interested in negotiating with the Palestinians have to negotiate with the PLO.

173. However, when there is not enough political will on the part of all parties concerned to achieve a just settlement, a long time may pass before the Arab people of Palestine can enjoy full freedom and before the dangerous hotbed of tension which exists in the Middle East, and which poses a serious threat to international peace and security, is eliminated. We are aware of the fact that extensive and resolute international efforts will be required in order to establish in the Middle East a lasting and equitable peace for all States and nations.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[2] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

[3] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15403, annex.

[4] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[5] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[6] See A/40/87, AHG/Res.123 (XX).

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1984*, document S/16456.

[8] A/34/631, para. 367.

[9] *Ibid.*, para. 368.

[10] New York, Times Books, 1983.

[11] New York, Morrow, 1984.

[12] New York, Simon and Schuster, 1984.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

93rd PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 10 December 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 99

Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. POLOWCZYK (Poland), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: I have the honour to introduce the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 99 contained in document A/39/708. In paragraph 18 of its report, the Third Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution which was adopted in the Committee without a vote. I take this opportunity of adding that, owing to a technical error, the names of the following sponsors were omitted: Italy and New Zealand. This will be rectified in the official records of the General Assembly.

I submit the recommendation of the Third Committee to the General Assembly for adoption.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Third Committee.

2. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Third Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

3. May I remind members that in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401 the General Assembly decided that, when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. May I also remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

4. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 18 of its report [*A/39/708*].

5. The Third Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/46).

6. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has just taken an important decision in adopting this Convention, which crowns the success of seven years of hard work. I wish to congratulate all concerned, on the constructive and co-operative spirit in which they approached this task. The Convention represents a major step towards creating a more humane world and I am especially pleased that the Assembly has taken this decision on this day, the thirty-sixth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

7. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on this resolution.

8. Mr. HAMER (Netherlands): My delegation had asked to explain its position on the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. We have listened with attention to your words, Mr. President, and we concur. We are extremely pleased that this resolution has been adopted by consensus. I will not use the opportunity to say more or to explain our position.

9. Mr. FERM (Sweden): The Governments of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and my own country, Sweden, are highly gratified at the unanimous adoption of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

10. The fact that the Assembly has taken this important decision on Human Rights Day, the thirty-sixth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, reminds us of the significant progress made by the United Nations in the standard-setting field. The Nordic countries hope that the unanimous adoption of this Convention will contribute to eliminating once and for all this scourge which has continued to plague mankind despite the international ban.

11. Ever since Sweden, in 1977, took the initiative to elaborate the Convention, the Nordic countries have been closely associated with this work. The road towards the Convention has been long and sometimes difficult. It is important now that the Convention enter into force as early as possible and that it be made effective by truly universal adherence.

12. I have the honour and pleasure to announce that the Nordic countries will sign the Convention as soon as it is opened for signature and take steps towards early ratification.

13. Mr. GÓMEZ-GÓMEZ (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The effort made by the Third Committee to prepare, consider and agree on the text of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment must be applauded in the General Assembly. This has been given final approval today, for the benefit of all peoples, on a particularly important date, since it

commemorates the adoption by the United Nations 36 years ago of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

14. It implies a triumph of the human being's victory over brutality and violence and no opportunity should be lost to reaffirm and reiterate the lofty values that should enjoy juridical protection and be the constant concern of States and of all leaders who bear the responsibility for guiding them politically. It must not be possible in the present era, when we evoke humanism as an element of Government programmes, the letters and the arts, for anyone to repeat Nietsche's cynical comment that "the State is the coldest of cold monsters".

15. Today we are not faced with a situation of peace or war—war which is the source of all evils for the individual. But there are various areas in the world where violence upsets the normal life of States and impairs the implementation of norms which would ensure the individual rights and social guarantees as provided for in national legislation. I am referring particularly to those countries with a juridical system that has been established in order to ensure that those individual rights and social prerogatives will be protected and where electoral legislation guarantees free and independent elections which are organized by independent institutions, thus ensuring no interference in the normal development of functions.

16. It is necessary to connect the internal situation, founded on a respectable and efficient juridical system aimed at protecting such important individual rights and social guarantees, to democratic political development and the protection of human rights.

17. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a noble document whose moral and political importance should be constantly emphasized because the struggle of mankind which is so widely represented in this world parliament, the universal Organization in which we are participating, must be an uninterrupted struggle and there must be constant vigilance. The task is to ensure that the dignity of man is respected and his rights protected so that he can express himself without fear or risk to his physical integrity, either orally or in writing. He should be able to express his own political convictions and he should be able to express what he basically needs and what his spiritual aspirations are within the framework of established law guaranteeing his rights.

18. Today, peace, which is the undeniable contribution that the United Nations has made, is a great force with tremendous power, and it must be used in order to ensure that peace and anti-violence will be given the importance that war and violence have been accorded in the past. In some parts of the world violence is causing grave suffering to peoples, destroying their wealth, paralysing productive activity, requiring the manufacture of subversive arms and controlling vast economic and financial resources which could be used to solve the crushing problems of peoples. These are solutions that mankind has needed since its beginning because man, either isolated individually or as part of society, has always had shortcomings, and this has meant that there are needs that require solutions. Since the most ancient times, we have seen that there must be an individual with his own aspirations but who is also part of the social nucleus. The success of these solutions will ensure that Governments are effective and that their prestige will be greater—because they must be Governments supported by public opinion which will make it possible to ensure respect for human rights. The greatest eras of mankind occurred at times when humanism governed. The United Nations is the most appropriate forum for leaders of States to yield in their dogmatism and pre-determined ideas, because they run contrary to tolerance as tolerance is tantamount to respect for the beliefs of the individual as long as the individual has recourse to the legal provisions protecting his rights.

19. Mankind has received much from the desire for peace and justice that has been indicated by wise Governments, and there are social systems which are designed to improve man's lot. This will for peace, anti-violence and justice has given mankind much more than calculating political cunning. Albert Einstein said that international political astuteness is what, in the final analysis, engenders universal distrust, and he said that Moses was a better reformer of mankind than Machiavelli ever was. Therefore, when violence tries to replace entrenched systems or totalitarian systems which do not admit any changes in order to improve man's condition, or in order to give each and every inhabitant a legal basis on which to call for his own justice or freedom, the first victim is truth. In conditions of violence, truth is seriously violated and there are occasions when well-intentioned investigations are destroyed because of *de facto* circumstances and because rights are held in check. When there is suffering in some sectors of the population, it is necessary to be extremely objective to act as judge rather than as a party to the conflict. We must ensure that one party does not prevail over another by means of violence, when there is an attempt to kill in order to achieve power rather than to conduct oneself in a civilized fashion in order to attain power by means of the majority in an electoral process.

20. In order to preserve and to contribute to the preservation of human rights in their entire range, it is necessary to take into consideration how national juridical systems guarantee them in the framework established for this purpose. We must encourage the reform of political and social institutions. They must be modernized, they must be broadened and they must be extended to various sectors which have different views so that there can be pluralism enabling the participation of minorities in political life, of opposing forces, since unanimity is not possible among human beings. Without freedom of political organization of parties, without trade union organizations and without State statutes guaranteeing participation and suffrage among all sectors, it will not be possible to consolidate the democratic structure of a nation. In view of the violence, we have to attack two sources, and this is the lofty purpose of the United Nations, its committees and its various representatives. Here they can continue to contribute to eliminate the various causes of violence in order to protect the human rights of all inhabitants of any given country. Mediation must be pursued in political action and in a productive dialogue which will narrow differences among men. Enough can never be done to ensure that the electoral process will prevail so that legality will prevail in resolving antagonism in society—and there will be antagonism as long as man lives on earth. We must evince these values so that we shall not be prisoners of our dogmatism and so that we shall be ready to accept having our conflicts settled by means of mediation.

21. A comparative study should be undertaken of the domestic legislation of States in whose territories there are cases of violence. This would make it possible to prepare a report on how human rights are being guaranteed. Human rights should be the privilege not only of the supporters of the Government in power but, rather, of the entire population.

22. The PRESIDENT: I remind the representative of Colombia that the 10-minute limit has been reached. I therefore ask him kindly to conclude his statement.

23. Mr. GÓMEZ-GÓMEZ (Colombia): We interpret the great desire of all peoples when we consider and advocate the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, when we contribute to the study of a convention on the rights of the child and when we discuss cruel and inhuman or degrading treatment, all of which is implicit in the body of humanitarian law establishing effective human rights for every being on Earth.

24. If we refer to rights for human beings which are established in a given geographical region, the United Nations should now renew its faith in man and his place in society, and his moral, economic and juridical status as well.

25. Mr. SCHIFTER (United States of America): Thirty-six years ago today, the General Assembly proclaimed, in article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment". This clear statement has since been repeated and amplified in numerous international documents, including the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment of 9 December 1975 [*resolution 3452 (XXX), annex*]. These international instruments have served an important function in the struggle against torture by establishing the standard against which we can measure the behaviour of Governments and their officials.

26. From a legal and historical perspective, the process of standard-setting in this field must be counted as a significant achievement. It is no longer acceptable, in the eyes of the international community, for a Government to claim that the way it treats its own citizens is solely an internal matter if the treatment in question violates the provisions of international instruments which set human rights standards. The States Members of the United Nations can be justly proud of this positive evolution in international opinion, launched so dramatically by the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But the mere setting of standards, as we all know, is not enough.

27. There is ample evidence of a wide gulf between lofty words and the unacceptable practices which continue unabated in many parts of the world. One of the most flagrant continuing violations of human rights is torture, a crude violation of everything that we understand by the word "human". As long as it persists, further steps are needed to translate our words into action to eliminate this abhorrent practice.

28. Therefore, the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment which we have just adopted. The Convention is the product of seven years of arduous negotiations in a Working Group of the Commission on Human Rights, as well as informal consultations and final revisions agreed at the present session of the General Assembly. It is a compromise text which, to our sincere regret, limits the implementation mechanism of the Convention.

29. In the final analysis, however, it is the States members of the international community which are morally responsible for implementing the existing prohibition against torture and other forms of ill treatment.

30. We hope that the Convention just adopted will help to mobilize the political will of States to end the resort to torture as an accepted practice of law enforcement agencies.

31. Mr. YEDID (Israel): My delegation has been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/39/708 on the understanding that the Convention does not supersede the 1949 Geneva Conventions[1] regarding applicability to armed conflicts.

32. Mr. RUIZ CABAÑAS (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Pursuant to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, just adopted by the General Assembly, it is a pleasure for me to inform the Assembly that the Secretary of Foreign Relations of Mexico, in the course of his appearance before the Senate on 27 November 1984, stated, in response to a specific question, that Mexico supports the Convention against torture ". . . not only because it appears in the text of our Constitution itself, but also because it signifies elemental respect for human rights and for the freedom, dignity and integrity of mankind". Moreover, he stated:

> "All of us consider that it is indispensable and necessary for harmonious coexistence of mankind for there to be complete respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Mexico, which has been an energetic advocate of these causes of human rights and fundamental freedoms in international forums, does bear the commitment of ensuring that, both domestically and externally, elemental respect for fundamental freedoms and human rights must exist."

33. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): On Human Rights Day, which we are celebrating today, the General Assembly has adopted the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. This Day is marked by the adoption of a Convention, as well as by the adoption, on the initiative of the Third Committee, of a number of important decisions guaranteeing the right of peoples and of each individual to life, the right to fight against a State policy of *apartheid* and racism, which has been declared an international crime, and expressing condemnation of dictatorial régimes and encouragement of the struggle against the neo-Nazi practices and ideologies.

34. In marking this day, the United Nations has undertaken new efforts to oppose the most intolerable, flagrant and massive violations of fundamental human rights and freedoms which are directly linked with the imperialist policy of enslavement, racism and lawlessness.

35. On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism, the peoples of the world well remember the Nazi jails, gas chambers

and death camps in Maidanek, Dachau, Auschwitz and Mauthausen, where millions upon millions of people were brutalized, tortured and burnt in ovens. The Convention against torture, like the important decisions I have mentioned, is designed to prevent and avert in the future any repetition of such atrocities. Today, the policies of racism and enslavement of peoples include the practice of terror, brutality and torture as a fundamental element. In the contemporary racist jails of *apartheid* and dictatorial and totalitarian régimes, the same methods and weapons of torture are used that were used by the Hitlerite butchers. The Nazi criminals, hiding from the retribution of the peoples with the help of their protectors, who are known to all, often take personal charge of the business of butchery and pass on their experience in destroying people.

36. True to our socialist ideals, the Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, is in favour of the total elimination of the shameful practice of torture and inhuman treatment, and supports the adoption by the United Nations of immediate measures to eliminate such practices and policies. In the work on the draft Convention against torture, in the course of its discussion in the Third Committee, the Soviet delegation consistently proposed intensifying and expanding the definition in the Convention of the concept of torture, so as to close any loopholes or any possibility of using torture on the pretext of various reservations.

37. The socialist countries have made great efforts to achieve constructive agreements, particularly with regard to the competence of the Committee against Torture, to be established in accordance with article 17 of the Convention, which should be consistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and contemporary international law. The inclusion in the draft Convention of changes put forward by the socialist and other countries makes it possible to bring the competence of this Committee into line with the provisions of the important human rights covenants and conventions in this field. This, in the final stages, ensured unanimous approval for the draft Convention. While supporting the adoption of this compromise document, the Soviet Union opposes, and will continue to oppose, the outrageous practice of torture and those criminal régimes which resort to that practice.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Elections to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other elections:

(*a*) Election of fifteen members of the Industrial Development Board;

(*b*) Election of twenty members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;

(*c*) Election of twelve members of the World Food Council;

(*d*) Election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;

(*e*) Election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;

(*f*) Election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme

38. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will proceed first to the election of 15 members of the Industrial Development Board to replace those members whose term of office expires on 31 December 1984.

39. The 15 outgoing members are: Australia, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iraq, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Panama, Sierra Leone, Spain, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela. Those members are eligible for immediate re-election.

40. I should like to remind delegations that after 1 January 1985 the following States will still be members of the Industrial Development Board: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chad, Chile, Democratic Yemen, Finland, France, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Sudan, Switzerland, Uganda, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Arab Emirates and the United States of America. Those 30 States are therefore not eligible for election.

41. Under rule 92 of the General Assembly rules of procedure, all elections must be held by secret ballot and there shall be no nominations. May I, however, recall paragraph 16 of General Assembly decision 34/401, whereby "The practice of dispensing with the secret ballot for elections to subsidiary organs when the number of candidates corresponds to the number of seats to be filled should become standard . . . unless a delegation specifically requests a vote on a given election."

42. In the absence of such a request, may I take it that the Assembly decides to proceed to the election on that basis?

It was so decided.

43. The PRESIDENT: I shall now read the names of the candidates which have been endorsed by their respective groups.

44. For six seats from list A: China, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, the Philippines and Sierra Leone; for five seats from list B: Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; for one seat from list D: Czechoslovakia.

45. Since the number of candidates endorsed by groups A, B and D corresponds to the number of seats to be filled in those groups, I declare those candidates elected members of the Industrial Development Board for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985.

46. I call on the representative of Suriname as Chairman of the Group of Latin American States.

47. Mr. GUDA (Suriname): I should like to inform the Assembly that Nicaragua has withdrawn and that the Latin American Group therefore endorses the

candidacies of Ecuador, Mexico and Venezuela for election to the Industrial Development Board.

48. The PRESIDENT: Since the number of candidates in list C now also corresponds to the number of seats to be filled, I declare Ecuador, Mexico and Venezuela elected members of the Industrial Development Board for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1985.

Australia, China, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Mexico, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela were elected members of the Industrial Development Board for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985 (decision 39/309).

49. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I congratulate the States which have been elected members of the Industrial Development Board.

50. The General Assembly will now proceed to the election of 20 members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme to replace those members whose term of office expires on 31 December 1984.

51. The 20 outgoing members are: Afghanistan, Botswana, Burundi, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Greece, Guinea, India, Jamaica, Mexico, Morocco, Oman, Poland, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay. Those members are eligible for immediate re-election.

52. I should like to remind members that after 1 January 1985 the following States will still be members of the Governing Council: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, China, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Togo, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire. Therefore those 38 States are not eligible for election.

53. Under rule 92 of the rules of procedure, all elections must be held by secret ballot and there shall be no nominations. May I, however, recall paragraph 16 of General Assembly decision 34/401, which has been reproduced as annex VI to the rules of procedure, whereby "The practice of dispensing with the secret ballot for elections to subsidiary organs when the number of candidates corresponds to the number of seats to be filled should become standard . . . unless a delegation specifically requests a vote on a given election". In the absence of such a request, may I take it that the Assembly decides to proceed to the election on that basis?

It was so decided.

54. The PRESIDENT: I should like to announce that the Chairmen of the regional groups have informed me of the following candidatures which have been endorsed by their respective groups: for six seats from Africa: Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Niger and Tunisia; for four seats from Asia: India, Jordan, Oman and Sri Lanka; for two seats from Eastern Europe: Bulgaria and Poland; for four seats from Latin America: Colombia, Jamaica, Mexico and Panama; and for four seats from Western European and other States: Canada, Malta, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

55. Since the number of candidates from each group corresponds to the number of seats to be filled in that group, I declare those candidates elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985.

Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mexico, Niger, Oman, Panama, Poland, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985 (decision 39/310).

56. The PRESIDENT: I congratulate all the States which have been elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme.

57. The Assembly will now consider agenda item 16 (*c*), concerning the election of twelve members of the World Food Council. In this connection, the Assembly has before it a note by the Secretary-General [*A/39/297*], containing a list of the nominations by the Economic and Social Council.

58. The 12 retiring members are Botswana, Canada, China, Colombia, Gambia, Greece, India, Mexico, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Yugoslavia.

59. The following States have been nominated by the Economic and Social Council: three African States for three vacancies: the Ivory Coast, Kenya and Zambia; three Asian States for three vacancies: China, Sri Lanka and Thailand; three Latin American States for two vacancies: Brazil, Colombia and Mexico; one Socialist State of Eastern Europe for one vacancy—Bulgaria; three Western European or other States for three vacancies: Canada, Turkey and the United States of America.

60. I call on the representative of Colombia.

61. Mr. GÓMEZ-GÓMEZ (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Two months ago we informed the Economic and Social Council of the withdrawal of Colombia's candidature in this election.

62. The PRESIDENT: I have to inform representatives that the Chairman of the Group of Latin American States, in a letter dated 22 October 1984, informed me that the candidatures of Brazil and Mexico have since been endorsed by that group for the two seats allocated to it on the World Food Council, and members have just heard the statement by the representative of Colombia.

63. In accordance with paragraph 16 of General Assembly decision 34/401, the Assembly may dispense with balloting when the number of States nominated from among the groups is equal to the number of seats allocated to each of those groups.

64. May I take it, therefore, that the Assembly wishes to declare those States elected members of the World Food Council for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1985?

Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mexico, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey, the United States of America and Zambia were elected *members of the World Food Council for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985 (decision 39/311).*

65. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Assembly, I wish to congratulate all the States which have been elected members of the World Food Council.

66. We shall now turn to agenda item 16 (*d*), concerning the election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

67. In this connection, the Assembly has before it a note by the Secretary-General [*A/39/298*], which contains a list of the nominations by the Economic and Social Council to fill the vacancies in the Committee which will occur as a result of the expiration on 31 December 1984 of the terms of office of the following States: Germany, Federal Republic of, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia.

68. The following States have been nominated by the Economic and Social Council: three Asian States for one vacancy: Bangladesh, Iraq and Sri Lanka; two Latin American States for one vacancy: Bolivia and Trinidad and Tobago; two Socialist States of Eastern Europe for two vacancies: the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and Yugoslavia; and three Western European or other States for three vacancies: Germany, Federal Republic of, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

69. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq): As part of the consensus package agreed upon earlier by the Group of Asian States, Iraq withdrew its candidature for the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. We would like to confirm that withdrawal of our candidature.

70. Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): Although the Economic and Social Council nominated Sri Lanka to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, as indicated in document A/39/298, my delegation decided in a spirit of co-operation and compromise to abide by the decision of the Group of Asian States to endorse Bangladesh's candidature to fill the Asian vacancy on the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. Sri Lanka therefore wishes to withdraw its candidature.

71. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform representatives that the Chairman of the Group of Asian States, in a letter dated 22 October 1984, informed me that Bangladesh was the candidate chosen by consensus for the one seat allocated to that group on the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. In that regard, members of the Assembly have just heard statements by the representatives of Iraq and Sri Lanka.

72. I call on the representative of Suriname, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Latin American States.

73. Mr. GUDA (Suriname): I have the honour to inform the Assembly that Bolivia has withdrawn as a candidate for the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, and that therefore we have only one endorsed candidate, that is, Trinidad and Tobago.

74. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation simply wishes to confirm what the Chairman of the Latin American Group has said, that Bolivia, for the sake of the unity of the group, has decided to withdraw its candidature for the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

75. The PRESIDENT: The number of States nominated by the Group of Asian States, the Group of Socialist States of Eastern Europe, the Group of Western European and other States and the Group of Latin American States corresponds to the number of seats allocated to each of those Groups.

76. In accordance with paragraph 16 of General Assembly decision 34/401, I take it that the Assembly wishes to declare those States elected members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985.

Bangladesh, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, the Netherlands, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia were elected members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985 (decision 39/312).

77. The PRESIDENT: I congratulate the States which have been elected members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

78. The Assembly will now turn its attention to agenda item 16 (*e*), which concerns the election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries.

79. Since no candidate has been put forward, I suggest that the General Assembly decide to defer until its fortieth session the election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that such is the wish of the Assembly.

It was so decided (decision 39/313).

80. The PRESIDENT: I invite members to turn their attention to the note by the Secretary-General dealing with the election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme [*A/39/799*]. In this note, the Secretary-General informs the General Assembly that he proposes to nominate Mr. Mostafa Kamal Tolba to be Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme for a further four-year term beginning on 1 January 1985.

81. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to elect Mr. Mostafa Kamal Tolba Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1985, as recommended by the Secretary-General?

It was so decided (decision 39/314).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):*

(*h*) Confirmation of the appointment of the executive director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;

(*k*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries

82. The PRESIDENT: I invite members of the Assembly to turn to the note by the Secretary-Gener-

---

*Resumed from the 3rd meeting.

al on agenda item 17 (*h*) [*A/39/800*], in which he proposes to reappoint Mr. Abd-El Rahman Khane as Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for a further period of two years ending on 31 December 1986, or until the date on which the Director-General of the new United Nations Industrial Development Organization assumes office, whichever is the earlier. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to confirm that appointment?

It was so decided (decision 39/315).

83. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to explain its position.

84. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): My delegation simply wishes to state that we have acquiesced in the appointment proposed by the Secretary-General in his note in the interest of an expeditious transition of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization into a specialized agency, and we hope that this process of transition will proceed to a conclusion with the briefest possible delay. However, our acquiescence should in no way be taken as prejudicing our choice of the permanent Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization once that transition is concluded.

85. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to agenda item 17 (*k*).

86. In his note relating to the confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries [*A/39/798*], the Secretary-General states that he is not submitting an appointment for confirmation by the General Assembly. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to take note of the information contained in the note by the Secretary-General?

It was so decided (decision 39/316).

AGENDA ITEM 30

Co-operation between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee: report of the Secretary-General

87. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, Mr. B. Sen, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/2 of 13 October 1980.

88. Mr. SEN (Secretary-General of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee): Sir, please allow me, on behalf of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, to offer our warmest felicitations to you on your election to the high office of President of the General Assembly. We are fully aware of the outstanding role of your country in the cause of Afro-Asian solidarity and the leadership you have yourself provided in the efforts of the United Nations in so many areas, particularly in the struggle against *apartheid*.

89. It is barely three years since the General Assembly, by its resolution 36/38, adopted on the occasion of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to carry out consultations with the Secretary-General of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee with a view to further strengthening the co-operation between the two organizations and widening the scope of such co-operation. The report [*A/39/565*] presented by the Secretary-General at the present session amply bears out the progress that we have already achieved within this short time span. This satisfactory outcome is no doubt due to the significance that our member Governments attach to the Committee's role in support of the work of the United Nations; but equally important has been the active interest that the Secretary-General of the United Nations has taken in promoting co-operation in wider areas between the United Nations and our organization.

90. The areas of co-operation between our organization and the United Nations and its various organs and agencies have over the years covered extensive fields, including law, economic relations, the environment, the problem of refugees, resources of the ocean and outer space. Some of the substantive issues included in our work programme, whether by way of reference from member Governments or that were taken up by the Committee as being matters of common concern, relate to items of ongoing work of the United Nations and thus contribute to better understanding and progress of the work of the United Nations in important areas. In addition, we have undertaken specific programmes and initiatives to assist our member Governments in their participation in the work of the United Nations, to promote wider acceptance of the treaties and conventions adopted under United Nations auspices and to enhance the role of the International Court of Justice.

91. One specific area of special interest to our organization has been the work of the Sixth Committee. At the suggestion of several of our member Governments, we have during the past three years undertaken the task of preparing notes and comments on the major agenda items of the General Assembly relative to the work of the Sixth Committee and have endeavoured to arrange for informal exchanges of views within our membership on such issues. In this process, we felt convinced that continued consultations between interested delegations on the complex and intricate issues that are dealt with in the Sixth Committee were necessary for the meaningful progress of work in that forum, and that time had to be found for in-depth discussion in the Sixth Committee of those items which were in the final stages of consideration and those that related to progressive development and codification. This, it was felt, might become feasible by a rationalization of the work schedule of the Sixth Committee.

92. At a meeting of legal advisers of our member States held in November last year, some collective thinking and reflection was focused on these questions, and an informal paper was prepared containing various suggestions that had been put forward in the meeting. The ideas contained in the paper were of a preliminary nature and were advanced simply to generate discussion among interested delegations. One of the objectives behind the suggestions contained in the paper was to find ways and means to avoid the almost automatic repetition of some of the agenda items and debates, which the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his report on the work of the Organization [*A/39/1*] had occasion to describe as expensive, time-consuming and ineffective in terms of practical results. The informal paper was circulated as a document of the Sixth Committee

[*A/C.6/38/8*] at the request of 64 delegations, in order to facilitate further consultations, which were carried out at an informal level in April this year, during the meeting of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization, and also at the beginning of the present session of the General Assembly. It was felt that the ideas contained in the paper could be tried out gradually in the work of the Sixth Committee, and we were gratified to note the careful consideration the informal paper received from the Chairman and the other members of the Sixth Committee.

93. In our work in support of the United Nations we have attached a great deal of importance to the working out of the framework and modalities through which States could reap benefits in practical terms from the norms and practices recognized in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, particularly with regard to optimum utilization of the resources of the oceans, both living and non-living. Our organization was closely involved in the process of negotiations on the law of the sea for more than a decade, and we regard the conclusion of the Convention as an outstanding achievement of the United Nations in an area where principles of international law, economic interests of nations and political realities are so inextricably interwoven. Many nations had looked forward to the new order of the oceans to meet their goals and aspirations for betterment of the living conditions of their people through access to the vast resources of the oceans, and it is in this area that efforts may now need to be made to translate the norms into reality.

94. The work of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority, to be located in Jamaica, is of great significance in spelling out the principles of common heritage over the resources of the deep sea-bed. Our organization is participating in that work and has presented papers for consideration of the Special Commission on the Enterprise. At the same time, we feel that efforts are needed to assist developing countries to reap maximum benefits from the resources that have now been brought within national jurisdictions. Even before the adoption of the Convention, some of the United Nations agencies had already drawn up plans and programmes for conservation and management of the living resources and had also taken steps towards promoting better knowledge about non-living resources that could be exploited with advantage.

95. We have felt in the course of our study on the economic, scientific and technical co-operation in the use of the Indian Ocean, which we undertook at the initiative of the Government of Sri Lanka, that if the programmes undertaken or proposed to be undertaken by the various United Nations agencies could be properly co-ordinated with the needed support and inputs by Governments, a great deal of progress could be expected towards optimum utilization of such resources. There might still be some areas which would need to be tackled through regional co-operation or national efforts, but the areas where such efforts would be productive could best be identified after due appreciation of the plans and programmes undertaken by the United Nations agencies themselves. I am happy to be able to report that our process of thinking has already found some support, and we have had the benefit of consultations with the United Nations offices and agencies concerned at an informal meeting held here at the end of September this year.

96. I should perhaps mention that the concept of regional or subregional co-operation for reaping the benefits from the resources of the oceans in an orderly manner is rapidly gaining ground in our region. For example, a subregional grouping between a number of island States, including Mauritius, Seychelles and Reunion, has already come into existence, and the Government of Sri Lanka is actively pursuing the idea of convening a conference of a group of States bordering the Indian Ocean. But even in the field of regional co-operation, a great deal of assistance and advice will be needed from the United Nations agencies. To promote national capabilities and expertise, assistance may also be needed for preparation of legal instruments in consonance with the provisions of the Convention, and perhaps also in finding matching partners for joint venture projects. We on our part have now prepared a model of legislation relating to fishery resources in the Exclusive Economic Zone; this model has been widely distributed. We have also prepared a model of an agreement for fishing by foreign nationals, as well as two models of possible joint ventures; but much more still needs to be done in co-operation with the appropriate offices and agencies of the United Nations.

97. Our organization has also been engaged for some years towards assisting in the process of international economic co-operation for development. Soon after the eleventh special session of the General Assembly, which was held from 25 August to 15 September 1980, a Ministerial Meeting on Regional Co-operation in Industry, held in Kuala Lumpur on 8 and 9 December 1980, recommended that our organization should co-ordinate the formation of an open-ended informal group of technical experts in the legal and economic fields for rendering assistance to Governments on technical aspects of issues that could be the subject matter of global negotiations. We had looked forward to the launching of global negotiations, in the expectation that the two-phased approach, as worked out at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, and at the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 held at Buenos Aires in April 1983 would be a realistic move towards a breakthrough. We sincerely believe that negotiations on a wide range of interrelated issues at a global level would be the best means of ensuring long-term stability in the world economic system and accelerating the economic growth of developing nations. At the same time, taking into account that the process of economic co-operation is neither an abstract nor a static concept, reflecting as it must the growing interdependence of nations, we have felt it necessary to embark on certain areas of work that could promote, encourage and strengthen that ongoing process.

98. Recognizing the fact that any form of co-operation in the economic field must necessarily depend on the mutual interests of nations, whether developed or developing, we consider it important to bring about sufficient awareness of the need for adoption of new strategies for the 1980s which could promote a concept of partnership between the North and the South, as well as between the countries of the South *inter se*—a partnership that would be equitable and beneficial to both sides and that could relate to the

traditional industrial sectors and to new areas such as economic wealth in the Exclusive Economic Zone. It would be unrealistic in the present context to conceive of trading and investments without some benefits being imparted to the country of investment in a tangible fashion. It would be equally unrealistic to expect a flow of investments without ensuring adequate protection, whether such investments emanate from a developed or developing country. To this end, we are continuing our efforts towards improvement of the climate for investments through model bilateral agreements for promotion and protection of investments, adoption of an integrated scheme for settlement of economic and commercial disputes and preparation of a framework and guidelines for joint ventures.

99. By way of another initiative, we have decided to sponsor an informal meeting in New York this week which will bring together a selected group of participants at the senior level, drawn from our member Governments, with representatives of trade, industry and banking, including specialized institutions and United Nations agencies. The purpose of the meeting would be to identify possible sectors of investments where the concept of partnership could be promoted, types of co-operative arrangements or joint ventures that might be appropriate, and the financing of investments; also to spell out the essential factors conducive to investments, such as the protection of investments, investment incentives and modalities for settlement of disputes. We hope to plan similar meetings in the future, and we look to the United Nations offices and agencies for their continued support.

100. As a supportive step to the United Nations programmes for development in Africa, our organization, in association with the Government of Egypt, wishes to sponsor a meeting in Cairo in March next year at the senior official level to discuss the framework for bilateral co-operation in economic development between the countries of the region through the harnessing of their resources. The meeting would also consider the concrete framework needed to attract a wider flow of investments in mining and development sectors.

101. The Secretary-General, in his report on the work of the Organization [*ibid.*], has drawn attention to the important work that was being done by the United Nations in the humanitarian field, including the problem of refugees. Our organization initiated a study on the subject in co-operation with UNHCR as early as 1964, which culminated in the adoption of a set of principles known as the Bangkok Principles, 1966. The Bangkok Principles largely contributed to the adoption of the Declaration on Territorial Asylum [*resolution 2312 (XXII)*] in 1967. Further work in this area was continued in subsequent years, which resulted in the preparation of an addendum to the Bangkok Principles as well as the adoption in 1969 of a resolution on Palestinian refugees. At our Tokyo session, held last year, we decided to take up the subject once again at the suggestion of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and a preliminary study on the principle of burden-sharing will be presented at our Katmandu session in February 1985. The main purpose of the study would be to assist the efforts of the High Commissioner in the humanitarian task of dealing with the problems of refugees by incorporation of the norms and practices that have gradually emerged into a set of legal principles for application in the practices of States. We may also examine in due course matters relating to "International co-operation to avert the flow of refugees" in the context of General Assembly resolution 37/121.

102. I have tried to give an account of the background of our thinking in respect of some of the important items mentioned in the Secretary-General's report on co-operation between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee. It would be our endeavour to continue the process of active co-operation as called for by General Assembly resolution 36/38 so as to ensure that our potentials are at the disposal of the United Nations when it deals with major issues in the fields of law and economic relations, as well as other areas within our competence.

103. In a few days the new year will be ushered in, which will be the fortieth anniversary year of the United Nations—a time for reflection on what we have achieved and what more can be achieved in realizing the goals and ideals of the universal Organization. The year 1985 will also mark the thirtieth anniversary of the historic Conference of Afro-Asiatic Countries, held at Bandung in 1955, out of which our organization had emerged. That Conference had also given the impetus for the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, embracing as it does as many as 103 nations from all parts of the globe. The fortieth anniversary of the United Nations will call for the harnessing of our energies and resources in support of the United Nations, to set in motion an era of peace and economic co-operation among nations for development. In this endeavour, we will sadly miss the guiding hand of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the late Prime Minister of India and the Chairperson of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We deeply mourn her loss and pay our humble homage to the memory of the departed soul.

104. The PRESIDENT: I call now on the representative of Japan to introduce draft resolution A/39/L.34 and Add.1.

105. Mr. KURODA (Japan): I should like first of all to thank Mr. Sen, the Secretary-General of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, for his useful introductory statement which I listened to with great interest. I am also grateful to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his informative report on co-operation between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee [*A/39/565*].

106. As one of its founding members, Japan attaches great importance to the work of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee. Established in 1956 for the study of legal and technical questions common to Asia and Africa, the Committee has since become a major forum for Asian-African co-operation in legal matters. Gradually orienting its activities to complement the work of the United Nations at the regional level, the Committee was accorded observer status with the United Nations during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly [*resolution 35/2*]. Its membership has grown from the original seven States to 40 States from the two continents, reflecting both the expansion of its activities and the spirit of co-operation among the Committee's members, as well as the untiring efforts of the Secretariat.

107. I should like to pay particular tribute to Mr. Sen, who has faithfully served as the Committee's Secretary-General ever since it was created. Indeed, the steady development of the Committee is in large part traceable to his unflagging enthusiasm and purposeful leadership, which have been a source of encouragement to each of the Committee's members.

108. I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute also to the late Mr. Soeleimar H. Tajibnapis, who was the Permanent Observer of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee to the United Nations. Until his untimely death last summer, Mr. Tajibnapis worked tirelessly for the Committee, particularly in advancing its co-operation with the United Nations. He will long be remembered for the valuable contribution he made to the work of the Committee.

109. In providing a forum for the free exchange of views and the discussion of common legal problems among experts from Asian and African countries having diverse economic and social systems, the Committee continues to contribute to the deepening of understanding and the promotion of friendly relations among countries in the two regions. But interest in the Committee extends beyond Asia and Africa, as evidenced by the increasing number of observers from countries on other continents which attend the regular sessions of the Committee. In fact, more than 30 such countries participated in the latest session, which was held in May 1983 at Tokyo.

110. Through its co-operation with the various bodies of the United Nations, the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee has clearly contributed to the promotion of peace and prosperity not only in the Asian-African region but throughout the international community as a whole. In addition to conducting regular consultations with the relevant United Nations bodies, during the past year the Committee organized joint seminars with the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, as well as meetings between legal advisers and Sixth Committee representatives to discuss various matters falling within the competence of the Committee. The Committee has also been actively promoting wider acceptance and ratification of multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the United Nations. It is also undertaking studies for the promotion of a wider use of the International Court of Justice by Asian-African countries.

111. These are just some areas in which the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee and the United Nations are working together to pursue common goals and to strengthen co-operation on legal matters of common concern.

112. We are convinced that the ever-deepening relations of co-operation between the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee and the world Organization will greatly benefit the countries of Asia and Africa and, indeed, countries throughout the international community.

113. Accordingly, on behalf of all the sponsors, I have great pleasure in introducing draft resolution A/39/L.34 and Add.1, which I recommend that the General Assembly adopt by consensus.

114. Mr. PEMMARAJU (India): It is with great interest and appreciation that we read the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization and heard the statement made by the Secretary-General of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee on the ongoing co-operation between the United Nations and the Committee. It is a matter of pleasure and pride for us members of the Committee to see and to contribute to the growing work and importance of the Committee in various areas of international law. Its work covers not only highly important and technical fields of international law, such as the law of treaties, commercial arbitration and judicial assistance, but also extends to such vital areas of interest to the international community as the environment, outer space, optimum utilization of ocean space and its resources, international trade and economic relations. Over the years, the Committee has also made, and continues to make, significant contributions to the humanitarian aspects of law, including the law of refugees.

115. Thanks to the imaginative leadership provided by Mr. Sen, Secretary-General of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, and the dedicated efforts of a small but highly competent staff, the Committee has grown not only as a respectable body providing reports and analysis on contemporary issues, but also as a significant forum for the exchange of views and the articulation of common interests. The meetings sponsored by the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee—be they annual sessions or other inter-sessional meetings on specialized topics and seminars—are attended not only by members of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, which now includes 40 States, but also by several other States from all parts and regions of the world, representatives of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, representatives of the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. Such wide and distinguished participation in the work of the Committee is indeed an indication of the measure of the value attached by the international community to the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee as a forum for exchange and harmonization of views. In this connection, we have no doubt that the next annual meeting of the Committee, scheduled to be held in Katmandu, will be a success, as was its session in Tokyo in 1983. The agenda for that meeting promises a rich fare on matters of current interest and of practical significance, not only to members of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee but also to the Members of the United Nations in general.

116. As the reports of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee have made very clear, the work and activities undertaken by the Committee are closely co-ordinated to promote objectives and matters of specific interest to the United Nations. The Committee effectively participates as an observer in the work of the United Nations, particularly during the sessions of the General Assembly. Its contribution to the work of the Sixth Committee, in particular, deserves special mention. In the last three years, since it has been admitted as an observer, the Committee has been able not only to help its member States with notes, memoranda and briefs on various agenda items before the Sixth Committee but was also able to recommend a number of ideas for rationalization of the procedures of the work of the Sixth Committee. In this connection, the informal meetings organized by the Committee involving legal advisers of the member States of the Committee and attended also by several other representatives as

observers, last year proved very timely and yielded an excellent and frank exchange of views which were welcomed by the Sixth Committee.

117. This year the Committee has taken yet another positive and innovative initiative to promote the broader goals of the global negotiations in a concrete manner by organizing three-day informal consultations in New York between the representatives of the member Governments of the Committee and representatives of trade, industry and banking, which are also to be attended by United Nations specialized agencies and other institutions. The informal atmosphere expected at this meeting on global economic partnership, preceded by a careful preparation by the Committee, will help us consider various ideas on joint ventures, experience of foreign investment in traditional sectors as well as new areas, a framework for investment, conditions for investment and mode of financing, control, management, modalities for settlement of disputes, and of course, the most important problem of debt crisis.

118. We are confident that the mutually advantageous co-operation that exists between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee will continue to expand to the benefit of the international community. Such co-operation is essential and will surely serve the cause of world peace and order, based on respect for international law and justice. Accordingly, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/39/L.34 and Add.1, and like the representative of Japan, we commend it to the General Assembly for adoption by consensus.

119. May I conclude my statement by paying our humble homage to Mr. Tajibnapis, in whose death we have lost a friend, a diplomat and a tireless worker for the cause of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee.

120. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform Members that Senegal has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

121. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/39/L.34 Add.1?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/47).

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970–973.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

94th PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 11 December 1984, at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia)

AGENDA ITEM 10

Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization

1. The PRESIDENT: In previous years, the General Assembly has taken note of the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization. This document has been referred to with great interest on several occasions in the course of this session. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/1*].

It was so decided (decision 39/413).

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the International Court of Justice

2. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the International Court of Justice covering the period from 1 August 1983 to 31 July 1984 [*A/39/4*]?

It was so decided (decision 39/414).

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte: report of the Secretary-General

3. The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Said Kafe Madi Soilihi, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, to introduce draft resolution A/39/L.42.

4. Mr. Said Kafe MADI SOILIHI (Comoros) (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly is meeting here to discuss for the ninth consecutive year this painful problem which is a matter of concern not only to the people and Government of the Comoros but also to the international community as a whole. I refer to the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte.

5. Every time the Assembly has had to consider this question we have tried to show, by citing specific facts, how this problem, which arose because of an injustice and a flagrant violation of both international law and internal French law, had been trumped up by rather subtle procedures in order to destroy the unity of our country and preserve special interests.

6. I should like to describe the situation once again to the Assembly and provide it with some points of information to shed some light on this debate.

7. In this Assembly and in all other international and regional organizations in which this matter has been discussed, we have always stated that Mayotte is, and cannot but be, Comorian land. France, during its 130 years in the Comoros, never questioned or challenged the unity of the Comorian archipelago; in fact, it did the opposite.

8. Basing themselves on history, successive French Governments, on many occasions, emphasized the need to respect the territorial unity of a country whose homogeneous people share the same language, the same culture and the same religion—something which is quite rare. Thus, this unity is not, as some would try to claim, based on artificial grounds or administrative convenience. Rather, this unity derives from the common history of the sister islands that make up the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros: the islands of Anjouan, Grande-Comore, Mayotte and Mohéli.

9. It is therefore clear that all French laws and administrative arrangements adopted during the colonial period recognized the unity of the Comorian archipelago. The French law of 9 May 1946, to begin only with that one, states that the archipelago is "a territory enjoying administrative and financial autonomy"; and in its explanatory statement it indicates clearly: "it is the Muslim religion which gives the archipelago its strong unity, reinforced by a single language, Swahili".

10. The legislators would not have proceeded in such a way unless nature had bequeathed to us this unity, which was thus reaffirmed and consolidated by the law which granted internal autonomy to the Comorian archipelago on 3 January 1968.

11. When France was led to recognize the desire of the Comoros for independence, agreements were signed in Paris on 15 June 1973 between representatives of the French Government and representatives of the local government of the Comoros. Those agreements provided, among other things, that a referendum would be organized in the Comoros and that, if the majority of the population made a choice in favour of independence, the overall results, for all of the four islands as a whole, would have the effect that the Chamber of Deputies on that date would be granted the powers of a constituent assembly, and the President of the local Government Council would be granted the competence and prerogatives of Head of State.

12. That provision faithfully reflects the emphasis placed on the undeniable unity of our archipelago on the eve of its self-determination, and it was supported by solemn statements made by the highest French authorities at the time.

13. Thus, the Secretary of State for French Overseas Departments and Territories stated on 26 August 1974, in speaking about our self-determination, that the French Government had chosen in favour of a general referendum for three reasons:

> "first, for the legal reason that under the rules of international law a territory retains the frontiers that it had as a colony; secondly, a multiplicity of different statutes for the various islands of the archipelago is inconceivable; thirdly, it is not for France to set the Comorians against each other."

Mr. Olivier Stirn went on to state that France refuses to divide the Comoros, which have the same people, the same Islamic religion and the same economic interests.

14. Two months later, these points were confirmed by the President of the French Republic, Mr. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, who stated at a press conference on 24 October 1974:

> " . . . Is it reasonable to imagine that one part of the archipelago should become independent and that one island, whatever feelings of sympathy we may have for the inhabitants, should maintain a different status?
>
> "I believe that we must accept contemporary reality. The Comoros are a unity, they have always been a unity, and it is natural that they should share the same fate . . .
>
> "On the occasion of the independence of a territory, we should not propose to break the unity of what has always been the single archipelago of the Comoros."

15. As can be seen from those statements, there was absolutely no confusion concerning the unity of our country, and that unity was not challenged. That is why the people of the Comoros went quite tranquilly to the ballot boxes to decide their future on 22 December 1974, in accordance with the agreements of 15 June 1973 and the law of 23 November 1974 concerning the organization of the referendum on self-determination. The Comorians pronounced themselves, by an overwhelming majority of 95 per cent, in favour of independence for their country.

16. On the basis of that clear and unambiguous response, it was incumbent upon the French Government and Parliament to endorse the results of the ballot and to act in accordance with the agreements of June 1973. Thus, a draft bill was submitted on 10 June 1975 to the National Assembly for ratification of the referendum on self-determination. That draft bill was in accordance with the procedure agreed upon in the 1973 accords, namely, overall independence for the archipelago on a date fixed by the two parties. Unfortunately, to the great surprise of everyone, something quite different occurred.

17. The French Government, completely rejecting its own commitments, adopted on 3 July 1975 another law, described in the Comoros as an iniquitous law, for it called into question the original bill and made the accession of the Comoros to independence subject to completely new and unacceptable conditions on the pretext that part of the population in Mayotte had pronounced itself against independence. The Comorian people were shocked, and international public opinion made known its indignation and disappointment. The French Government thus violated not only its own internal law but also international public law. Indeed, it violated the sacrosanct rule of the indivisibility of overseas territories and colonial entities, so dear to the French Constitution, and it also completely ignored the sacred principle of the inviolability of borders inherited from the colonial period.

18. Drawing the necessary conclusions from those new provisions adopted by the French authorities, President Ahmed Abdallah Abderemane, backed by the clearly expressed will of the Comorian people and with the approval of the local Chamber of Deputies, unilaterally proclaimed the independence of the Comoros on 6 July 1975.

19. Because of the justice of our cause, recognition by the international community of our independence was immediate and massive. Indeed, my country was admitted to the United Nations on 12 November 1975 as a sovereign State composed of four islands, including Mayotte, and that was done by the unanimous adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 3385 (XXX).

20. That resolution, in conformity with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2621 (XXV), concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, thus proclaimed the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the whole of the territory that it inherited from the colonial period.

21. However, determined to pursue to the end its illegal plan to occupy part of our territory, despite the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, the French Government adopted, on 31 December 1975, a law recognizing the dismemberment of our country. That law recognized, admittedly, the independence of the Comorian State, but it was a State from which part of its territory, the island of Mayotte, had been cut off. This unjust and arbitrary action was immediately condemned by the international community, which regarded it as interference in the internal affairs of the young Comorian State. Thus, the French Government, seeking justification and legal pretext for its show of force, decided to organize two referendums on the island of Mayotte on 8 February and 11 April 1976.

22. The argument advanced was that the inhabitants of that island should have the opportunity to express their wishes concerning their future; but mention was deliberately omitted of the fact that this was not a case of giving up a territory or an addition or exchange as provided for in article 53 of the French Constitution. An attempt was made to present it in that way, incorrectly; but what was in fact involved was a secession from a single territory, the Comorian archipelago, for which the procedures and modalities had proceeded in proper form.

23. It is also deliberately forgotten that, as my country had already been admitted to membership of the United Nations on 12 November 1975, with full respect for the principle of territorial integrity, these two referendums were undeniably an infringement of the decolonization charter of the United Nations. In this context, I would recall that the response of the Organization was absolutely clear. In resolution 31/4, adopted on 21 October 1976, the General Assembly declared that France's occupation of Mayotte "constitutes a flagrant encroachment on the national unity of the Comorian State", and that the Assembly:

> "*Condemns* and considers null and void the referendums of 8 February and 11 April 1976 organized in the Comorian island of Mayotte by the Government of France, and rejects:

> "(*a*) Any other form of referendum or consultation which may hereafter be organized on Comorian territory in Mayotte by France."

24. Like the United Nations, most major international and regional organizations that regularly deal with this question have quite rightly expressed their disapproval.

25. Thus, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, reaffirmed in its Political Declaration the undeniable sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte. It stated:

> "With regard to the Comorian island of Mayotte, which is still under French occupation, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that it is an integral part of the sovereign territory of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros. They also expressed their active solidarity with the people of the Comoros in their legitimate efforts to recover that island and preserve the independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed their support for the overall results of the referendum carried out on 22 December 1974 in the entire territory of the Comoros and rejected all proposals for a new referendum in Mayotte."[1]

26. Our cause is supported also by the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*], which, at each of their sessions, have called on France to return Mayotte to the Comorian State.

27. Let me recall here that at the time when our country was being subjected to this injustice, several voices were heard in France strongly condemning these actions and protesting against them. For example, the deputies of the French Socialist Party, in the opposition at the time, submitted to the Constitutional Council of their country on 13 December 1975 an application condemning the law relating to the consequences of self-determination for the Comorian islands. They quite rightly expressed the opinion that the French law recognizing the sovereignty of the Comorian State over only three islands of the archipelago, but not over the island of Mayotte, was unconstitutional. I shall quote a few arguments from that application in order to shed more light on this question. It stated:

> "We consider that this law is contrary to the Constitution for the following reasons: whenever the legislature or the executive has acted, it has done so on the basis that the archipelago of the Comoros was a single territory . . . Thus, it is quite clear that the French Republic has never called into question the territorial unity of the Comoros archipelago while international public opinion has constantly felt that the four Comorian islands were a single territory dependent on and administered by the French Republic under the conditions set forth in articles 72 *et seq.* of the Constitution."

That is a very clear, unequivocal position.

28. Even today, some statements made by the highest French authorities on similar problems or on the question of Mayotte recognize explicitly our unity and the good grounds for our position. Thus, speaking of Chad, the Head of State of France, Mr. François Mitterrand, stated:

> "We cannot accept this *de facto* situation becoming a recognized act of partition. The independence, sovereignty and integrity of any State recognized by international society is a fundamental principle of French policy . . . "

29. Looking at that important statement, one cannot fail to draw the parallel between the inviolability of the frontiers of Chad and those of the Comoros. Indeed, in one case as in the other, the international community has recognized this.

30. Only very recently, the French Minister of the Interior and Decentralization for Overseas Departments and Territories, Mr. Georges Lemoine, when questioned about the political future of Mayotte, stated to the newspaper *Le Monde* that:

> "We cannot just cover our eyes and say that all the problems relating to the question of Mayotte have been solved . . . After all, there are international forums and international rules, especially those that remind us that decolonization takes place within the perimeters of what had been colonized and that the Comorian entity was made up of four islands. The Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros is still justified in stating that decolonization was not complete and that, on the level of sovereignty, Mayotte is a dependency of the Comoros."

31. Hence, it can be quite easily appreciated that today we are entitled to be astonished when, such positions having been taken, there is still this effort to claim that yet another referendum on self-determination should be organized in one part of our national territory.

32. As we have already said, it is not a question of reversing the roles in this specific case of concern to us. We are not asking for the addition to our country of one part of French territory; rather, we are simply asking for the restitution of part of our national territory under the sacred law of the inviolability of frontiers inherited from the times of colonization.

33. As we have said time and again, the solution to this problem is not to be found in the repeated organization of referendums that have been condemned and rejected in advance and declared illegal by the international community as a whole. The solution can come only from honest and sincere dialogue and agreement between the two States, France and the Comoros, in accordance with the relevant recommendations and resolutions of international organizations.

34. As far as we are concerned, we have always expressed our willingness, in that spirit, to reach a just and swift solution to this problem. It is high time for our voice to be heeded. And we justifiably consider that the sooner this is done the better, if we wish to avoid tragic and regrettable situations such as those that we witness, alas, in other parts of the world. It is indeed imperative to prevent such situations in order to maintain the atmosphere of tranquillity which does prevail in our region.

35. The people and Government of the Comoros are aware of the rightness and justice of their claim. There is no argument whatsoever that could shake their determination that the struggle they are waging to regain their territorial integrity is a legitimate one. This year again, they will greatly appreciate the constant and unanimous support that will be evidenced by the United Nations in adopting the draft resolution now before the General Assembly, endors-

ing our position in this debate. We sincerely hope that the draft resolution will be adopted unanimously.

36. Mr. OYOUÉ (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is again considering the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte. A member of the OAU *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven on the Comorian Island of Mayotte, the Gabon delegation is pleased to participate in this debate.

37. I should first like to recall that the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven, which was established in July 1976, under resolution CM/496, adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its twenty-seventh ordinary session, is to propose solutions for the problem we are considering today. I wish also to point out that the membership of this committee is made up mainly of African countries, including Algeria, Cameroon, the Comoros, Madagascar, Mozambique, Senegal and Gabon, which serves as Chairman.

38. In the course of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, my delegation expressed its hope [*65th meeting*] that this question would be settled as speedily as possible. We were encouraged by the mutual understanding expressed by both parties, as well as by the fact that they seemed to be evincing good will in an effort to achieve a just and lasting solution to the problem by means of negotiation.

39. In the course of the current session, our country's position has not fundamentally changed, since there have been no new positive developments.

40. At any rate, my delegation is gratified at the fact that the two Governments—French and Comorian—have demonstrated their readiness to engage in dialogue. This has been demonstrated by the trip to Paris for a visit of friendship and work in June 1984 by President Abdallah, the Head of State of the Comoros. While it is unfortunate to note that the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven was not informed of the results of the talks, our country still considers that such a step is a good sign. Indeed, at a time when many States frequently settle their disputes by force, one must actively support those States that agree to settle their conflicts by peaceful means, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

41. However, despite the climate of confidence and friendship between the two parties, it must be acknowledged that no significant progress has been made since the Assembly discussed the question at its thirty-eighth session [*64th and 65th meetings*]. The current situation, which is akin to a *status quo*, cannot go on indefinitely, since that would run the risk of impeding the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros from exercising its sovereignty over all of its national territory, in accordance with international law. In this regard, we shall continue to recall the fact that, in the colonial era, the Comorian archipelago formed a geographical whole. Moreover, the organization of a referendum on self-determination by the Administering Power in 1974 confirmed that reality, because that procedure was applied to all of the territory and not island by island. It is self-evident that the new independent State of the Comoros encompasses quite logically all of this former colonial territory, that is to say, the islands of Anjouan, Grande-Comore, Mayotte and Mohéli.

42. At the regional level, the OAU, which has considered this question, entirely endorses this approach to the problem. Within this context, Gabon, in its capacity as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven of the OAU, took some initiatives with the French and Comorian authorities in order to reach a settlement to the dispute. In addition to the thirty-eighth, thirty-ninth and fortieth regular sessions of the Council of Ministers of the OAU, which were held in 1982, 1983 and 1984, respectively, our country attempted to organize a meeting of that body so that we might define a programme of action regarding this problem. But given the lack of a quorum, and because of the crisis the OAU was experiencing at that time, those meetings could not take place.

43. However, quite recently, on the proposal of his Comorian colleague, Mr. Martin Bongo, Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Gabonese Republic, in a letter dated 25 May 1984, proposed to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs that he receive a mission from the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven during the first two weeks of July 1984. We are still awaiting a reaction from the French side to this request, a request that two months ago was again made through diplomatic channels by the Gabonese authorities.

44. With the unblocking of the situation after the last summit meeting of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, Gabon believes that the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven will be more dynamic and pursue its activities. In this connection, my delegation would like to emphasize the particular interest that El Hadj Omar Bongo, President of the Gabonese Republic and Head of State, attaches to a peaceful settlement of this dispute, as well as to the initiatives for a settlement.

45. In these circumstances, Gabon, in its capacity as the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven on the Comorian Island of Mayotte, would like once again urgently to appeal to the French Government to redouble its efforts and continue the dialogue with the Government of Moroni, so that it will be possible, together, to find the most suitable ways and means to reach a final settlement based on legitimate rights and safeguarding the interests of the parties, with full respect for the complete sovereignty of the Comorian State over the entire archipelago, including the Comorian island of Mayotte.

46. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): The question of the Comorian island of Mayotte has been before us for over eight years now. Each year, the Assembly has reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over Mayotte and has called for the achievement of a just solution to the problem through negotiations between the Governments of France and Comoros.

47. In the statement he has just made, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros made a comprehensive and lucid presentation of the question.

48. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has consistently attached importance to a prompt settlement of the question of Mayotte. At the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, the Ministers and Heads of Delegation reaffirmed that Mayotte "is an integral part of the sovereign territory of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros and called upon the Government of

France to promptly terminate its occupation over the island" [*see A/39/560, para. 47*].

49. Earlier, at their Seventh Conference, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries had "reaffirmed their support for the overall results of the referendum carried out on 22 December 1974 in the entire territory of Comoros and rejected all proposals for a new referendum in Mayotte."[1]

50. While it is indeed a matter of disappointment that no progress has been made towards a solution of the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte, the continuing contacts between the parties concerned are a source of some encouragement. The stated commitment of the current French leadership actively to seek a just settlement of the question is another positive factor. Consideration by the Assembly of this question today provides us, the non-aligned countries, with an opportunity to urge that efforts to find a peaceful and negotiated solution to the question of Mayotte be intensified with a view to their early fruition. It is our sincere hope that the commitments given prior to the referendum on self-determination of December 1974 concerning respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Comoros will be honoured.

51. In this connection, we were encouraged to note the commitment of the Government of France, as reiterated most recently in the note verbale, dated 10 September 1984, which the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and which is cited in the Secretary-General's report, as follows:

> "The atmosphere of trust which has been established between France and the Comoros is conducive to the continuation of a constructive dialogue between the two Governments with the aim of finding a solution to the problem of Mayotte that is acceptable to all, in conformity with international law and the Constitution of the French Republic." [*See (A/39/518, para. 5.*]

52. At the same time, I am also constrained to recall the point stressed in the note verbale, dated 1 September 1984, which the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Co-operation and External Trade of the Comoros addressed to the Secretary-General and which is also cited in the Secretary-General's report, as follows:

> "in spite of the willingness repeatedly proclaimed by the latter [the Head of State of France] to seek with the Comorian side without delay a just solution to the problem within the framework of Franco-Comorian friendship, no specific proposal has been put forward by the French authorities" [*ibid., para. 4*].

53. I venture to believe, on the basis of these assertions by the two sides, that the gap separating the two positions is not that wide and that, with the requisite good will and renewed effort, a peaceful negotiated solution will soon be found to this problem, which has unfortunately been left pending in the process of decolonization of the Comoros archipelago.

54. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): For almost nine years now the General Assembly has considered the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte. As everyone will recall, this question was first inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly in 1976, at its thirty-first session [*item 122*]. Since that time, the international community has been following the matter with interest at the level of the United Nations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the OAU. Thus, over the years, from one session to another of these different forums, it has followed carefully the tireless efforts of the parties involved, namely, France and the Comoros, and by the relevant organs of the bodies cited to bring about a just and lasting settlement of the question.

55. However, we must point out that for some time now there has been no major development in this matter. Since the meeting three years ago of the OAU *Ad Hoc* Committee of Seven, which deals with the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte and of which my country, Senegal, is a member, and since the Niamey session in August 1982 of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, no substantive progress has been made towards a negotiated solution.

56. It is regrettable that the constructive proposals made by the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the solemn commitment entered into by the parties directly concerned on the settlement of the question of Mayotte through negotiation have not brought about the desired results.

57. In his communication dated 8 June 1984 [*see A/39/518, para. 3*], the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity reported to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that the problem of Mayotte had not evolved at all, despite numerous contacts at the highest level between the Comorian and French Governments.

58. The Senegalese delegation is aware of the delicate nature of this problem. That is why it is convinced that only persistent efforts at dialogue by the parties can create the conditions required for a just solution that is acceptable to all. It is therefore glad that in their frank and cordial bilateral relations, the Comoros and France have shown the international community that they have a common desire to overcome the difficulties still facing them and to move towards a truly constructive dialogue.

59. The Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, Mr. Said Kafe Madi Soilihi, and the representative of France have always said that their Governments are willing to continue negotiations in a spirit of mutual understanding.

60. This common desire to find an honourable solution to the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte strengthens our conviction that a peaceful, just and lasting settlement of the question of Mayotte is possible provided the parties to the dispute make more determined efforts to ensure the speedy resumption of their talks.

61. We therefore call earnestly for a swift resumption of the dialogue, which must be in the spirit of the Charter of the OAU and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, particularly resolution 3385 (XXX), in which the General Assembly reaffirmed the necessity of respecting the unity and territorial integrity of the Comorian archipelago, composed, need I recall, of the islands of Anjouan, Grande-Comore, Mayotte and Mohéli.

62. It is essential that a just solution rapidly be found to the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte, for that question could, with time, threaten international peace and security.

63. The United Nations, one of whose main tasks is to promote peace and understanding between peoples and nations, must take the opportunity offered by the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly to issue an urgent appeal to the parties directly concerned to move resolutely towards a process leading to the drafting without further delay of an agreement that will provide a final solution to the problem of Mayotte.

64. My country, which has the advantage of having excellent relations with France and with the Comoros, will spare no effort to make its modest contribution to the attainment of an honourable solution to this problem. Provided that solution is a just and lasting one, it will, we believe, have the best possible effect on relations between France and the Comoros and between the French and the Comorian peoples, who, in addition to the historical and cultural ties that bind them, are both equally devoted to the ideals of international peace and solidarity.

65. Mr. AL-GHAFARY (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is nine years since the United Nations first took up the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte. Despite the resolutions of the Organization and other international and regional bodies, such as the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the OAU, all of them calling for a prompt, just solution to this question and for serious negotiations aimed at eliminating what is considered a legacy of colonialism, we have yet to see any visible progress in the matter. This question has been brought before the United Nations time and again without a just and comprehensive solution being found.

66. In keeping with the policy of my country based on respect for the independence, unity, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States and the inadmissibility of foreign intervention in their internal affairs, from this international rostrum we call upon the parties concerned to find a solution to this problem by peaceful means, with respect for the sovereignty and national independence of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros.

67. The Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros has shown full understanding of and responsiveness to the appeals made by various regional and international organizations for the speedy solution of this problem, but there has been no visible progress, especially with regard to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 37/65, which called for negotiations between the parties concerned, France and the Comoros, in order to hasten the return of Mayotte to the motherland. It is important to recall that when the General Assembly admitted the Comoros to membership of the United Nations in 1975, it also reaffirmed the necessity of respecting the unity and territorial integrity of that country, which consists, as is well known, of an archipelago of four islands—Anjouan, Grande-Comore, Mayotte and Mohéli—with a single people having a common history and heritage.

68. The United Nations, one of whose main functions, as described in the Preamble to its Charter, is the promotion of peace and understanding among nations and peoples, must encourage the adoption of initiatives and resolutions which will, it is hoped, lead to the prompt resumption of negotiations and the drafting of an agreement between France and the Comoros which would provide the final solution to this problem.

69. As a member State of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Oman affirms the necessity of taking into consideration the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, as it relates to the Comorian island of Mayotte. In that declaration, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that the Comorian island of Mayotte

> "is an integral part of the sovereign territory of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros. They also expressed their active solidarity with the people of the Comoros in their legitimate efforts to recover that island and preserve the independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed their support for the overall results of the referendum carried out on 22 December 1974 in the entire territory of the Comoros and rejected all proposals for a new referendum in Mayotte."[1]

That appeal was made because that cause is just.

70. Oman's special interest in this question and its desire that an honourable solution to it be found is in keeping with the relations of friendship that link it to the two parties to the dispute. Our position on this question is very clear; it is one of full support for the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte, which has been affirmed in resolutions of the General Assembly. We favour a fruitful dialogue between the two parties to the dispute so that understanding may prevail between them, bound together as they are by a long history of friendly and cordial relations.

71. In reading the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/518*], we find that, regrettably, there appears to have been no progress on this question, judging by the correspondence between the parties concerned, the United Nations and the OAU. We call upon the United Nations to make further efforts to reactivate negotiations in order to bring about the settlement of this serious question without further delay.

72. The delegation of Oman is a sponsor—as it has been of similar draft resolutions in previous years—of the draft resolution regarding the Comorian island of Mayotte [*A/39/L.42*] now before the General Assembly. We therefore call upon the United Nations to promote negotiations and to urge the parties concerned to enter into them seriously in order to resolve the problem. Oman hopes that a prompt solution will be found, in the interest of the parties concerned and in implementation of the relevant international resolutions, with respect for the sovereignty and independence of the Comorian island of Mayotte. Thus peace and stability may prevail in that part of the world and a flame of peace may be lighted that will herald the beginning of the end of the pressing problems whose solution would be a service to the whole of mankind. This has always been the conviction that has guided the foreign policy of my country.

73. Mr. ZAIN (Malaysia): The policy of my Government in relation to the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte, which is now before the Assembly, is guided by the following factors: first and foremost, our conviction that the island of Mayotte is an integral and inseparable part of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros and that the unity, territori-

al integrity and sovereignty of the Comoros must be respected; secondly, our firm commitment to come out in defence of the independence, unity and territorial integrity of all States and, more specifically in this instance, our firm opposition to the dismemberment of a territory in the process of decolonization; thirdly, our ties of warm friendship and our co-operative relations with both France and the Comoros; fourthly, our deep admiration of and respect for the Government of the Comoros for the calm, reasoned, measured and open-minded manner in which it has pursued, and continues to pursue, through peaceful means, its just cause of reuniting the island of Mayotte with the rest of the Comorian archipelago, as well as for its continuing faith in and commitment to the United Nations to assist in the resolution of this problem; fifthly, our regret that France has not lived up to its best traditions to resolve this long outstanding issue; sixthly, our concern that the continued delay in the resolution of this issue may exacerbate the situation, complicate its resolution and be detrimental to peace and stability in that region of Africa; and seventhly, our distress that even on a matter such as this, in which the issues at hand are surely clear and unequivocal, the will of the international community, as expressed in the forums of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the OAU, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and here at the United Nations itself, still awaits its full implementation.

74. For all these reasons, my delegation has asked to speak in order to express our full support for draft resolution A/39/L.42. We wish to appeal once more to the two parties concerned—in particular to France, whose historic tradition, at its best, should place it on the side of freedom and full independence and whose commitments concerning respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Comoros, given in December 1974, prior to the referendum on self-determination, are unequivocal—to negotiate in good faith so that the resolution of this problem may be pursued energetically and effectively. This issue has been before the Assembly for far too long, since its thirty-first session to be precise. We are encouraged by some developments, more specifically the continuing efforts by France and the Comoros to increase co-operation in many fields which, we trust, will facilitate the search for a peaceful solution to the outstanding question between them relating to the island of Mayotte. We are also encouraged by the statement of the representative of France, at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, that: "The status of Mayotte is provisional . . . which does not close the door on any development" [*65th meeting, para. 43*].

75. We appeal to the Government of France to redouble its efforts and to continue its dialogue with the Government of the Comoros with a view to restoring the island of Mayotte to the Comoros, of which it is an integral part. It is Malaysia's earnest hope that, as a result, this item will not appear on the agenda of the fortieth session of the General Assembly, which can only redound to the credit of a great nation.

76. Mr. BHATIA (Pakistan): Pakistan enjoys close and friendly relations with both France and the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, and it is for this reason that we desire to see a speedy solution of the question of Mayotte, which remains the outstanding issue between the two countries. Our interest in the speedy settlement of the issue also stems from the fact that this problem concerns the territorial integrity of a sister Islamic and non-aligned country. The continued separation of Mayotte from other islands of the Comorian archipelago, over which the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros exercises its sovereignty, is also hurting the economy of this newly independent State, as well as of the archipelago as a whole.

77. The international concern over the continuation of the Mayotte question is evident in the repeated resolutions which have been adopted by the General Assembly during the past eight years, as well as in other international forums, including the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the OAU. In addition to the unambiguous reaffirmation of the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte, the decisions taken at all those forums have consistently emphasized the need for negotiations between France and the Comoros with a view to achieving an honourable and just agreement. It is disappointing that no significant progress has been achieved in the negotiations which have thus far been held intermittently between the two parties to discuss the issue.

78. In considering the question of Mayotte, we find the following factors to be relevant. First, on 13 December 1974, the General Assembly, by virtue of resolution 3291 (XXIX), reaffirmed the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros and emphasized that the archipelago comprises the islands of Anjouan, Grande-Comore, Mayotte and Mohéli. Secondly, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, clearly maintains that the principle of self-determination should apply to a colonial entity as a whole. Thirdly, the Government of France has declared its position, indicating its readiness to engage in a dialogue with the Government of the Comoros in a constructive spirit and to seek a just solution of the question of Mayotte. Fourthly, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the OAU have consistently emphasized the need for negotiations. The emphasis is found in the General Assembly resolutions which have been adopted since the Assembly considered this question for the first time at its thirty-first session.

Mr. Wasiuddin (Bangladesh), Vice-President, took the Chair.

79. Bearing in mind these factors, it is our hope that the Governments of France and the Comoros will intensify their efforts through negotiations to bring about a solution of the question of Mayotte consistent with the decisions of the United Nations. Draft resolution A/39/L.42 once again highlights the principled position maintained by the international community on this issue and urges the reopening of the dialogue between France and the Comoros. In supporting this draft resolution, we are motivated by an earnest desire to encourage an expeditious process of negotiations between the two countries, leading to an early solution of the problem on the basis of justice and recognized principles.

80. Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): My delegation has listened with attention to the comprehensive statement delivered this morning by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Islamic

Federal Republic of the Comoros on the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte. My delegation has also studied carefully the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/518*]. It is evident from the notes verbales addressed to the Secretary-General by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Co-operation and External Trade of the Comoros and by the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations [*ibid., paras. 4 and 5*], that the talks have yet to produce the solution needed to resolve the problem of Mayotte and that there is a need for a new impetus to get negotiations started on a more dynamic and positive basis. Given the facts of the situation, the continued separation of Mayotte cannot be justified on legal, political or moral grounds, and its political integration in the independent State of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros should be achieved without delay.

81. Throughout the centuries, the people of the Comorian archipelago have shared a common identity founded on the strongest ties of geography, history, culture and ethnic heritage. In more recent times, this common identity has been further emphasized by their aspirations to and demands for freedom and independence.

82. At the time when France agreed to allow the people of the Comoros to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, my country, like many others, believed that the outcome would be in accord with the wishes of the majority of the people: that the unity and territorial integrity of the new State would be assured; and that independence would open up new vistas of co-operation between France and the Comoros on the basis of the historical friendship which had existed between them.

83. We have seen the remarkable process of decolonization which France set in train soon after the Second World War and the support which that country gave to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). We had every reason to believe that the accession of the Comoros to nationhood would be brought about smoothly. Regrettably, however, the continued colonial status of Mayotte has disappointed the expectations of the people of the Comorian archipelago and, indeed, of the world community as a whole.

84. During the colonial era, the Comorian archipelago had always been administered by France as a single unit. Its inhabitants were free to move between the islands, and the political movement for independence found strong and popular support throughout the archipelago. Furthermore, in all other colonial situations where France has guided the people to independence, the verdict of the population as expressed at the polls has always been determined by the totality of the votes cast. In no case besides that of Mayotte has a constituent part of a State been allowed to be excluded from the verdict of the majority.

85. My delegation is encouraged by the greater degree of understanding shown by France in recent years towards the demand of the Comoros for the restitution of its rights with regard to Mayotte. The position of the Comorian Government has of course been upheld by the Security Council, the General Assembly, the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It is our sincere hope that the talks which have been initiated between France and the Comoros will lead to a speedy solution to this long-standing problem—a solution based on respect for the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros.

86. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): Ever since this issue was raised before the General Assembly, the international community has consistently pronounced itself in favour of the restoration of the island of Mayotte to the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros.

87. My delegation, like speakers before me, finds it regrettable that to date this just demand of the Government of the Comoros, endorsed by the international community, has not been met. Tanzania has consistently taken a stand in favour of respect for the territorial integrity and unity of States and, therefore, against the separation of the island of Mayotte from the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros. It is our considered opinion that the continuation of this situation only perpetuates a state of instability in the region. In this respect, we recall the unambiguous positions of the OAU, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations in favour of the speedy and unconditional resolution of the issue in the interest of respect for the territorial integrity and unity of the Comoros and peace and stability in the area.

88. The fact that this issue remains before us reflects the reality that, despite statements to the contrary, no meaningful action has as yet been taken by the Government of France to resolve this long-standing problem. While welcoming the various statements made by France, we still call on the French Government to translate its verbal pronouncements into concrete and positive action, in concert with the Government of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, towards the speedy resolution of the problem.

89. My delegation listened carefully to the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Comoros this morning. We consider this statement and the overall attitude of the Government of the Comoros to be a useful and positive contribution to the efforts to bring about the peaceful resolution of the problem. We thus hope that the General Assembly will give a resounding endorsement to the draft resolution before us, thus contributing not only to eliminating the last vestiges of colonialism in the area but, more specifically, to ensuring the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros.

90. Mr. AMR (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We had hoped that this year would bring a solution to the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte, as called for by numerous United Nations resolutions, the most recent being General Assembly resolution 38/13. Our hope was strengthened by the genuine desire demonstrated by the two parties to the problem to achieve a peaceful and just solution.

91. As the delegation of Egypt emphasized in its statement before the General Assembly [*64th meeting*], when this item was debated at the thirty-eighth session, Egypt has a special interest in this question, and its desire to see a just solution attained is strengthened by the relations of friendship and close co-operation which have always bound the two parties to the problem.

92. Egypt has always supported the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte, which has been affirmed by

numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, the OAU and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, which have called for respect for the unity and territorial integrity of the Comorian archipelago.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

93. We fully appreciate the concern of the Government of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros at the lack of progress in seeking a solution to the problem and the fact that the situation has not changed since the admission of the Comoros to membership of the United Nations in 1975. This concern was reflected in the communication of the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations [*see A/39/518, para. 3*]. That communication indicated that, despite the many high-level contacts between the Governments of the Comoros and France and the direct talks between the Heads of State of the two States, there has been no significant progress concerning the problem.

94. Nevertheless, in spite of this, we feel that there is room for optimism with regard to achieving a just, negotiated solution to the problem of the Comorian island of Mayotte. Our hope is based, first, on the genuine desire demonstrated by the two parties to the problem to continue the dialogue and to make efforts in order to achieve such a solution. That was evidenced in the notes verbales from the Government of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros and the French Government addressed to the Secretary-General [*ibid., paras. 4 and 5*]. Secondly, our optimism is based on the promise that France has already made in the wake of the referendum held on 22 December 1974 for self-determination of the Comorian archipelago. That promise is to respect the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros, to which were added the statements by President Mitterrand in which he affirmed his attachment to the idea of the integration of the island of Mayotte with the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros.

95. The delegation of Egypt hopes that the sincere intentions and efforts of both parties will be translated into concrete results in the near future, results which will preserve the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros by restoring its sovereignty over the island of Mayotte, so that the people of that country may devote their efforts to development and progress.

96. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation regrets that, once again this year, the question of the island of Mayotte appears as an item on the agenda of the General Assembly session. France can only oppose the draft resolution that has been submitted, owing in particular to paragraph 1 of that text.

97. However, we hope that a just and lasting solution can be found to this question, and the draft resolution relating to it quite rightly recalls the expression of the will of France for there to be such a solution. My delegation also considers it essential to pursue a constructive dialogue with the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros. The bonds of friendship and co-operation that unite our two countries should help us in this endeavour.

98. France, for its part, intends to continue to develop all economic, social and cultural bonds between Mayotte and the Comoros in order to promote a *rapprochement* among the islands of the archipelago.

99. The status of Mayotte does not exclude any evolution in keeping with international law and the Constitution of the French Republic that takes place within the context of respect for the choice of the populations involved. French legislation cannot but take these requirements into consideration. Thus, my Government is endeavouring, and will continue to endeavour, to gear its actions towards ensuring an equitable and lasting solution to this question.

100. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/39/L.42. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions (resolution 39/48).[2]

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine (*continued*):*

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

101. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I would like to ask the representatives here to do what for some may be a difficult task. I want them for a moment to put aside what all of us hear endlessly in this Hall: the slogans about the "Palestinian people" and their

---

*Resumed from the 92nd meeting.

"legitimate rights". Let us instead look at history and consider in turn the presumed grievances of the Arabs against Israel.

102. In May of 1967, Syria, Jordan and what was then a different Egypt prepared to attack my country. Arab States further afield also readied military forces to be sent to what many of them confidently assumed would be the final assault on Israel. True, they had failed to destroy Israel in 1948, but they had never lost hope that eventually they would succeed.

103. Arab leaders were not reticent in proclaiming their aims. "Our basic objective will be the destruction of Israel", President Nasser said on 27 May, eight days before the war. "Our goal is clear . . . to wipe Israel off the map", declared President Arif of Iraq on 31 May. "The Arab struggle must lead to the liquidation of Israel", explained Algerian President Boumédiene on 4 June. And on 5 June, the day the war broke out, Radio Damascus exhorted simply: "Throw them into the sea."

104. Israel asked the Jordanians to stay out, but King Hussein had his troops shell Jerusalem and, apparently putting faith in Nasser's assurances, attacked. On 8 June, Hussein broadcast this to his army: "Kill the Jews wherever you find them. Kill them with your arms, with your hands, with your nails and with your teeth." The result was that he lost control of all the territories his troops had forcibly seized in 1948: Judea, Samaria and eastern Jerusalem. Egypt lost the Sinai and Gaza.

105. The shock of the 1967 defeat led the Arab leaders to rethink their tactics. Having lost areas strategically vital to waging war against Israel, especially the commanding heights of Judea-Samaria, they realized that no military solution lay in view without first forcing Israel to retreat to the vulnerable pre-1967 lines. This would require the exertion of enormous political pressure. The Arab States would have to win over public opinion by a lengthy, sophisticated and comprehensive campaign. They would have to change the terms of the conflict so as to obscure its real nature and present it in a manner that would be plausible, even persuasive, to audiences outside the Middle East.

106. For one thing, the kind of open declaration of intent they had once indulged in so freely would have to be muted or even dispensed with completely. Obviously, it would not do to speak again of driving the Jews into the sea or continue to demand the annihilation of Israel. To much of the world this was simply unacceptable. New arguments would have to be marshalled to justify continued hostility against Israel. All the territories the Arabs had lost in 1967, territories which had been used by Arab leaders as staging areas for a war they themselves brought on, were now held up as examples of unbridled Israeli expansionism. The consequences of Arab aggression were thus presented as its causes.

107. The Arab leaders now demanded that these same territories be handed over to them. That they have managed to persuade some of the justice of their demand is at least curious. They present, after all, an entirely new theory in international relations. Never before have States which have lost territory in wars of aggression been able to assume so easily the mantle of the aggrieved party. Germany after the Second World War certainly did not; nor did the other aggressor States from that same war. In fact, there is hardly a case in which a repelled aggressor could demand anything, much less territory.

108. But what is even more amazing is that the Arab-inspired myth of "Israeli expansionism" persists, despite the fact that Israel, in the pursuit of peace, recently ceded, willingly, fully 92 per cent of the territory won in a war of self-defence, territory containing billions of dollars of investments and, what is more, a secure supply of oil. No victor in recorded history has behaved similarly. Clearly, however indignant some Arab leaders may be over their loss of territory in 1967, this cannot be the cause of a conflict which began long before.

109. If not the territories, are the Palestinian Arab refugees the cause of the conflict? Prior to 1967, in fact, it was the refugee problem that was the constant refrain of the Arab chorus. But there was no such thing as the refugee problem when the Arabs embarked upon their full-scale war against a fledgling Israel. On the day that five Arab armies invaded the new State of Israel, Azzam Pasha, Secretary-General of the Arab League, declared: "This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades." Nor was there a single Arab refugee when Haj Amin al-Husseini, the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and Hitler's collaborator, said in 1948: "I declare a holy war! Murder the Jews, murder them all!"

110. Far from expelling the Arabs, the Jews of Israel pleaded with their Arab neighbours to stay, as in Haifa, in Tiberias and in other well-known examples documented by the British authorities and many Western correspondents on the scene at the time. And in the years immediately following the conflict there were many moments of candour. For example, the Jordanian newspaper *Filastin* wrote on 19 February 1949: "The Arab States encouraged the Palestine Arabs to leave their homes temporarily in order to be out of the way of the Arab invasion armies." Habib Issa wrote in the daily *Al-Hoda* on 8 June 1951: "Brotherly advice was given to the Arabs of Palestine to leave their land, homes and property and to stay temporarily in neighbouring fraternal States, lest the guns of the invading Arab armies mow them down." As late as 6 September 1954, the Jordanian daily *Al-Difa'a* quoted this telling comment by one of the refugees: "The Arab Governments told us: Get out so that we can get in. So we got out, but they did not get in."

111. The Arab leaders not only chose to forget this history; they created a new one, at once absolving themselves of any responsibility for the refugees and pinning the blame on Israel. Again, as with the territories lost in 1967, the consequence of the 1948 war—Arab refugees—was presented as its cause.

112. But to make this scheme work, the refugees had to be maintained as refugees, permanently wretched, perpetually unsettled. The consistent refusal of Arab leaders to solve this problem is particularly tragic because it would have been so easy to do. After all, since the Second World War there have been well over 100 million refugees from many countries, and almost all have been successfully resettled. Israel, too, with its tiny area and crushing economic burden, successfully absorbed 800,000 Jewish refugees from Arab lands, refugees that were brought into being by that same 1948 war. Perhaps this is why in 1955, well before the eldorado of Arab oil gushed forth, Mr.

Elfan Rees, the Adviser on Refugees to the World Council of Churches, noted: "The Arab refugee problem is by far the easiest post-war refugee problem. By faith, by language, by race and by social organization, they are indistinguishable from their fellows of their host countries."

113. Still, despite the deliberate Arab policy of keeping the problem alive, the reality noted by Mr. Rees proved even stronger than Arab intent, for, over the years, nearly all of the refugees have been absorbed into the economies and societies of the countries of their residence.

114. Indeed, most Palestinian Arabs have homes. Many of them, in fact, live as full citizens in eastern Palestine or Jordan. Similarly, most of the Arabs of Judea-Samaria are not homeless refugees; they hold Jordanian citizenship and live in the same homes they occupied before the establishment of Israel. Several hundred thousand work in the Gulf oil States, but are no more "homeless" than are, for example, the many hundreds of thousands of foreign workers who work in Saudi Arabia and the neighbouring States. That a few hundred thousand remain unintegrated is because the Arab States have kept them incarcerated in refugee camps for political reasons. And yet the theme of "homelessness" persists, having been repeated endlessly—not without success—as a powerful weapon in the Arab political arsenal against Israel.

115. Over the years, however, Arab propagandists discovered that their claims about "usurped territory" and "homeless refugees" do not withstand critical examination. Before knowledgeable audiences, the embarrassments of chronology and causality, such as we have just seen, could not be waved away. They were compelled to resort, therefore, to a third and final argument. Brandishing the ever-popular slogan of "self-determination", they asserted that the "Palestinian people" have been denied their "legitimate rights" and that one of those rights that has been denied—so it is claimed—is the right to a "homeland". Significantly, the slogans of "Palestinian self-determination" and "legitimate rights"—and, by the way, who could object to phrases like that?—were introduced into common currency only after the defeat of the Arab attempt to destroy Israel in 1967.

116. It is an uncontested fact that during the 19 years of the Hashemite occupation of Judea-Samaria, the Arab leaders, the Arab media and Arab propaganda said next to nothing about a "homeland" or "legitimate rights" in Judea-Samaria. When "Palestinian rights" were spoken of, it was always in reference to Israel behind its 1967 lines, and the message was crystal-clear: Israel was to be destroyed for those rights to be obtained.

117. It is noteworthy that, under the British Mandate, it was the Jews of the country who called themselves Palestinians. The *Palestine Post*, the Palestine Philharmonic and the Palestine Brigade which fought against the Nazis were all Jewish. There were thus Palestinian Jews and Palestinian Arabs, although in those days, as we might recall, the Arabs did not emphasize a distinct Palestinian nationhood but always stressed their being part of the larger Arab nation.

118. This deep-rooted identification with the Arab nation did not diminish over the years. Yasser Arafat, head of the PLO, has said: "The question of borders does not interest us. Palestine is only a small drop in the great Arab ocean. Our nation is the great Arab nation extending from the Atlantic to the Red Sea and beyond." And Zuhair Mohsin, a member of the PLO Executive Committee, in 1977 put it this way: "There are no differences between Jordanians, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese. We are one people."

119. The process of forming a separate nation is a complex one. The development of a separate "peoplehood" is always a long historical process, and its culmination is expressed by the emergence of several shared attributes—most often, a distinct language, culture, religion and history.

120. But let us grant that, through a miraculous telescoping of history, what took other peoples centuries was achieved by the Palestinian Arabs almost overnight, by dint of declaration, and that they are entitled to a national home. But who are the Palestinian Arabs and where is their homeland? Let us hear what the Arab leaders themselves say about this.

121. The PLO, supposedly committed to "Palestinian self-determination", asserted from its inception in 1964 that its designs encompassed the entirety of Palestine, both its western and its eastern parts, both Israel and Jordan. This was underscored time and again, as at the PNC's eighth conference, in February-March 1971:

> "In raising the slogan of the liberation of Palestine and presenting the problem of the Palestine revolution, it was not the intention of the Palestine revolution to separate the east of the river from the west; nor did it believe that the struggle of the Palestinian people can be separate from the struggle of the masses in Jordan."

122. Given the current embrace between the PLO and Jordan, PLO leaders are naturally reluctant to publicize this long-standing claim. But their candid statements in the past are, I suggest, revealing. Shafiq Al-Hout, the PLO's United Nations spokesman, for example, is quoted by Zeid Refai, in "Hussein of Jordan: My War with Israel", as saying this in 1967: "Jordan is an integral part of Palestine, just like Israel." And Arafat said in 1974: "Jordan is ours, Palestine is ours, and we shall build our national entity on the whole of this land."

123. Now, some would expect the Jordanians to contest this. Not at all. On 2 February 1970, Crown Prince Hassan, addressing the Jordanian National Assembly, said: "Palestine is Jordan, and Jordan is Palestine. There is one people and one land, with one history and one destiny." And King Hussein—also, significantly, before another Arab audience—said on Egyptian television on 10 October 1977: "The two peoples are actually one. This is a fact."

124. On 24 September 1980, it was Marwan al-Hamoud, former Jordanian Minister of Agriculture, who insisted:

> "Jordan is not just another Arab State with regard to Palestine but, rather, Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan in terms of territory and national identity . . . . Though we are all Arabs, our point of departure is that we are all members of the same people of the Palestinian Jordanian nation, which is one and unique, and different from those of other Arab States."

125. King Hussein, again, in an interview given to an Arab newspaper in Paris, said on 26 December

1981: "The truth is that Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan."

126. And in the scholarly American journal *Foreign Affairs*, Crown Prince Hassan, again, in the spring of 1982, noted: "As a leading Jordanian social scientist has written, 'The Jordanians and Palestinians are now one people, and no political loyalty, however strong, will separate them permanently'."

127. And finally, and most recently, on 6 November 1984, King Hussein told the Kuwait paper *Al Anba*, "Jordan in itself is Palestine."

128. The declarations of the Arab leaders themselves confirm what both history and logic tell us. The area of Palestine is indeed the territory of Mandated Palestine, decreed by the League of Nations and comprising the present-day States of Israel and Jordan. It is absurd to pretend that an Arab in eastern Palestine who shares the language, culture and religion with another Arab some 10 miles away in western Palestine, an Arab who is often his close relative, if not literally his brother, is a member of a different people. Indeed, as we have seen, the PLO's officials and Jordan's rulers are the first to admit this.

129. Those who accept the notion of a Palestinian people must therefore wonder: how many Palestinian Arab peoples are there? Is there a western Palestinian Arab people and, just across that narrow stream known as the Jordan River, an eastern Palestinian Arab people? How many Arab States in Palestine does Palestinian self-determination require? Clearly, in eastern and western Palestine there are only two peoples, the Arabs and the Jews; and, just as clearly, there are only two States in that area, Jordan and Israel. The Arab State of Jordan, containing some 3 million Arabs, does not allow a single Jew to live there. It contains four fifths of the territory originally allocated by the predecessor of the United Nations, the League of Nations, for the Jewish national home. The other State, Israel, has a population of a little over 4 million, of which one sixth is Arab. It contains less than one fifth of the territory originally allocated to the Jews under the Mandate.

130. The claim of self-determination, then, is misleading, for the inhabitants of Jordan—which, incidentally, Hussein's grandfather, King Abdullah, wanted originally to call the Hashemite Kingdom of Palestine—are largely Palestinian Arabs, and within that population, western Palestinian Arabs are the majority. It cannot be said, therefore, that the Arabs of Palestine are lacking a State of their own, the ultimate expression of self-determination. The demand for a second Palestinian Arab State in western Palestine, and the twenty-second Arab State in the world, is merely the latest attempt to push Israel back into the hopelessly vulnerable armistice lines of 1949.

131. Individuals and Governments have been swayed by the superficial plausibility of the PLO's well-financed propaganda campaign. And within this very body one should not underestimate the reluctance of some to challenge a received idea, especially when it is sponsored by the Arab and Soviet blocs. But the truth matters. It mattered in 1938 when Hitler's prating of self-determination for the Germans of the Sudetenland was echoed by much of the world's press and government. The resulting enormous pressure, it may be remembered, forced the Czechs to cede the Sudetenland, an area that was indeed largely German in population, but that was also vital for the Czech defences. We all know the results of that other famous campaign for "self-determination".

132. The Arab-Israeli conflict, therefore, is not rooted in the territories that changed hands in 1967, nor in the refugees that resulted from the Arab attack on Israel in 1948, nor in any claimed lack of self-determination for the Arabs of Palestine. These, as we have seen, have been useful devices in the campaign against Israel. If the Arab-Israeli conflict is to be resolved, the first task is to have all the Arab leaders recognize Israel by right and not on sufferance, and cease their support of terrorist groups that openly proclaim their commitment to destroy Israel. We can then proceed to the real issues that can and should be negotiated between the parties.

133. May I add that only direct bilateral negotiations have any meaning and, therefore, any real chance of success, as the record of Camp David clearly shows. The call by the Soviet Union, among others, for an international conference is simply a ploy to provide a forum—perhaps I should say a coliseum—in which Israel can be thrown to the lions and the PLO legitimized. The Government of Israel utterly rejects such an idea.

134. But in direct negotiations, the Jewish State of Israel and the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan should make every effort to settle the main issues between them. The main issue between them is basically a border dispute. The final drawing of that border, the cessation of the state of war, the achievement of a peace that will allow for free movement of people and goods in both directions—all this will follow.

135. But, in addition to the delineation of borders, there is a problem of determining the ultimate status of the residents of Judea-Samaria, both Arab and Jewish. This, too, is a matter for careful face-to-face negotiations, which we have repeatedly called for and would welcome. Israel wants to end the military administration currently in place in Judea-Samaria as soon as possible, and that day will be hastened when Jordan, without pre-conditions, will come to the negotiating table. But let me say that some of the comments I have heard about this subject are ludicrous beyond belief. This is the most benign military administration in history, in which the residents of the area have the full use of the law courts to press their claims against the authorities. Many have done so, and many have done so successfully. And the Camp David accords make ample provision for the transition from a military administration to a civil polity in which individual and community rights will be fully secured.

136. It is important to make one point clear. There is little doubt that, no matter how the borders are drawn, a significant number of Arabs will continue to live side by side with their Jewish neighbours in Israel. It has long been recognized that being a minority is not necessarily a tragedy. All nations have their minorities. The tragedy is to be everywhere a minority. This was precisely the Jewish situation before the creation of the State of Israel. The Jewish people did not possess 21 Jewish States; nor did they already possess one Jewish State in Palestine and were merely demanding yet another. As for the Arab rejectionists, they employ a reverse logic. For them, it is a tragedy that Arabs should be a minority any-

where in the Middle East. They find it intolerable that some Arabs may live as a minority in Israel just as other people have lived as minorities in their midst. The only difference is that the Arab citizens of Israel enjoy the civil liberties and the rule of law, despite calumnious claims to the contrary, that are denied to many non-Arab peoples living under various Arab régimes.

137. Nor can we conceive of a peace that can deny Jews the right to live in their ancient homeland, for what kind of peace could be based on Hitler's principle that an area had to be *Judenrein*?

138. Arabs live and will continue to live in Judea-Samaria. There is no reason why Jews cannot do the same.

139. I know the waste of war, the waste of both sides, Arab and Jewish. I think peace can be achieved, but it can be achieved only without ignoring history or, still worse, deliberately reshaping history to camouflage the origins of hostility.

140. Western Palestine and eastern Palestine, Israel and Jordan, must come to the negotiating table just as Israel and Egypt did. They must talk about land and they must talk about people, about how to establish, however imperfect, a *modus vivendi* that will endure. We cannot expect the millennium, but we do, all of us, have a right to hope that the terrible waste of the past will not be repeated.

141. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): One of the grimmest legacies of the Second World War has been that conflict of cultures and interests which we commonly refer to as the Middle East question; the core and centre-piece of that is, of course, the question of Palestine. Few issues have taxed the strength and the resourcefulness of the United Nations as an institution more than that one has done. Few problems have called into question more than that one the capacity of the Organization to defuse potential conflict situations.

142. Our consideration of the question of Palestine this year takes place against a background with which we are all too familiar, a background of brutal acts of oppression and deprivation which are continuously being inflicted on the Palestinian people. The horrors of Beirut in 1982 are still fresh in our minds. These tragedies underscore the urgency of the question of Palestine and the need to find a solution without delay.

143. The old League of Nations, the precursor of the United Nations, foundered on the question of global security. In our day, we are enjoined by the dictates of history and of precedent to reflect on the causes of that failure and, from such reflection, to derive the will and the clarity of vision to focus our energies effectively. Many have been the hours of debate, whether in plenary meetings, in the Special Political Committee or in the Security Council, on the various intertwined aspects of the enduring Middle East situation. What emerges with crystal clarity from these deliberations is that any search for a solution that seeks to bypass the United Nations system loses legitimacy, credibility and the stamp of universal consensus. It makes little sense to fashion an institution for the organized expression of world opinion if that opinion is to be flouted with impunity, through the brazen assertion that the advantages derived from the unlawful but successful use of violence are non-negotiable and that regional aggrandizement is international virtue.

144. For this reason, therefore, my delegation reaffirms its support for the decisions of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983. We likewise reiterate our support for the early convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East which would include the participation, on an equal footing, of the Palestinian people through its representative, the PLO.

145. The report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*A/39/35*] properly focuses the attention of the General Assembly on the plight of the Palestinian people and on the intransigence of the occupiers of its homeland. My delegation congratulates the Chairman of that Committee, Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, for this valuable contribution and for the excellent manner of its presentation.

146. The recommendations contained in the report provide a positive programme of action, the implementation of which would greatly enhance the prospects for a comprehensive settlement. Those recommendations reaffirm the necessary role and responsibility of the United Nations in the search for a just and lasting solution. They afford an opportunity of breaking out of the current stagnation and taking the initiative to pave the way for a final overall settlement.

147. My delegation reiterates its view that the prospects for a lasting peace in the Middle East begin and end with the satisfaction of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. It is unacceptable that the proud Palestinian nation, with its own particular identity, should be condemned to the indignity of refugee camps and to be objects of global compassion. The Palestinian people must have its own independent State.

148. The struggle of the Palestinian people is an integral part of the world-wide liberation struggle. Its physical focus is a geographical area noted throughout history as a hotbed of contending cultures. It is a struggle complicated by a number of factors, among them the imposition upon it of the dynamics of an East-West ideological struggle, the false global defence perceptions of others who live quite far away from the region and an unrelenting preoccupation with the control of global communications and with the vital destiny of energy resources. Meanwhile, it is the Palestinian people, of course, which continues to suffer.

149. It was the United Nations that created the State of Israel. It is surely the responsibility of the Organization to ensure that this creation does not abrogate the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people or allow any schemes of fortuitous selectivity permanently to dispossess, deprive and disadvantage those whose claims merely reflect rights which we jealously protect for our own selves.

150. Apart from the principle on which I have just expounded, there are two others which Guyana considers to be essential in any overall solution of the entire Middle East problem. Israel must withdraw from all Arab territory occupied since 5 June 1967, including East Jerusalem, and do so quickly. Guyana can never condone the occupation by force of territory belonging to other States, whatever the pretext, the fiction or the spurious military justification. Security in the Middle East must be mutual—Israel's security cannot be constructed on the insecu-

rity of its neighbours, nor can that security be found in the unlawful retention of permanent symbols of injustice, constant and enduring injuries to contiguous nationalisms.

151. Another principle is that all States in the area, including the State of Israel, have the right to exist and to do so within boundaries that are secure and universally recognized. History has not accorded to all States the convenience of frontiers that suit the military defence requirements of modern warfare. Nevertheless, this fact should not be made an excuse for covetous expansionism and the digestion of wrongfully retained land by the intrusion of alien settlements, strategically and economically conceived to perpetuate original injustice.

152. While the Palestinian experience since the creation of the State of Israel has been one of dispersal and dispossession, it has also been one of faith, hope and resolve. The Palestinians have shown an enduring and admirable faith in the United Nations. Their authentic representative, the PLO, has participated diligently and constructively in the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. They have placed their faith in positive responses by the Security Council and the General Assembly to a programme of action such as that included in the current report. The PLO was the first to respond to the Secretary-General, indicating support for the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East, which is testimony to the seriousness and the statesmanlike approach of that organization to the solution of the problems of the region.

153. The PLO has mobilized a continuing struggle for the recovery by the Palestinian people of their homeland. In this endeavour, it is supported by the overwhelming majority of the international community. My delegation wishes to make special mention of the role of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat in reaching out, in difficult circumstances, to the conscience of the world on behalf of the people of Palestine. My delegation would also like to express special appreciation of the role played by the non-governmental organizations in support of the struggle of the Palestinian people.

154. The Government of Guyana, for its part, is most pleased to make a special contribution to the effort to maximize international support for the Palestinian cause, through the hosting in 1985 of a United Nations seminar on the question of Palestine.

155. What is called for now more than anything else is an end to Israeli intransigence and the practical commitment by that State to action consistent with the interests of peace and security in the region. Let us not allow ourselves to be deceived by words or by selective and distorted uses of history. Likewise, it serves little purpose for us to cling to outmoded slogans of the PLO being a terrorist organization. As the Secretary-General correctly and wisely said in his report on the work of the Organization [*A/39/1*], one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. The Palestinian people have a cause and that cause is the recovery of their inalienable rights. We must come to terms with Palestinian nationalism and with their desire to recover their freedom in their own independent State.

156. Let us, by the decisions we take in this debate, render the most vigorous support to the Palestinian people and so bring closer the day when, with their participation in all processes, the long-desired peace in the Middle East is finally secured.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See A/38/132 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 72.

[2] The delegations of the Dominican Republic and Guinea-Bissau subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

95th
PLENARY MEETING
Tuesday, 11 December 1984,
at 3.20 p.m.
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Helgason (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine (*concluded*):

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation considers the issue before the Assembly to be one of the most crucial issues confronting the international community, for, by virtue of the strategic importance of the Middle East and the fact that peace, security and stability cannot be established in the area without resolving the root cause of the conflict, the question of Palestine is central to international peace and security; but, above all else, it is a question of human freedom and dignity and the quest of a people, the people of Palestine, for recognition of their inalienable right to self-determination.

2. Thirty-six years after the partition of their land, the Palestinian people continue to be denied their most fundamental human, political and national rights, in flagrant violation of the basic norms of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and its resolutions and decisions. Israel has, to date, in a diabolical combination of force and arbitrary legislative and administrative measures, only paralleled by those of *apartheid* in South Africa, embarked on a campaign to entrench its domination in Palestine. Measures under way to change the demographic composition, geographical character and administrative status of the occupied Palestinian territories and to separate the Palestinian people from their historical and cultural homes, undermine their identity and question their national existence—and even physical annihilation—have formed part of this scheme. As a consequence, the Palestinian people not only have become second-class citizens in their own country, but also continue to be subjected to incessant humiliation, harrassment and all forms of violence, including murder. Assassination of Palestinian leaders has also become an integral part of the Israeli lawlessness visited upon the Palestine people by the Israeli occupiers.

3. The international community cannot afford to be indifferent when an entire people is systematically being annihilated in the Middle East. It should stand against Israeli aggression and for the Palestinian rights. Together with the recognition of those rights, the international community should embark on a process to put into effect concrete measures for their exercise without external interference. Those rights, as originally envisaged in General Assembly resolution 181 (II), adopted on 29 November 1947, and the right to return, the right to compensation, and so on, must be reiterated.

4. It is the United Nations which has a historical responsibility for the problem. It is the Organization which must continue to play the central role in its resolution, on the basis of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

5. The adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 3236 (XXIX), embodying the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination without external interference, the right to national independence and sovereignty, the right to return, the right to regain all their rights by all means possible and the right to recognition as a principal party in the search for a lasting peace in the Middle East, underscored the continued commitment of the United Nations to the restoration of Palestinian rights. It is in this context that despite numerous set-backs, all precipitated by the recalcitrancy and obstinacy of Israel, the international community has not been deterred from its principal objective of restoring peace in the Middle East.

6. It is in recognition of this fundamental consideration that the efforts of the international community have converged on the need for collective action under the auspices of the United Nations. The adoption by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, of the Geneva Declaration on Palestine[1] and the elaboration of the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[1] to work towards the realization by the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination, independence, freedom and free national and social development, underscores this position.

7. Furthermore, the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 38/58 C was essentially a recognition of the need to harmonize international efforts to find a just and lasting solution to the Palestinian question. In that resolution, the Assembly endorsed the call for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. That resolution embodies an international consensus on a framework for peace comprising the key elements of any process leading to such eventuality.

8. Consistent with this position, therefore, my delegation wishes to reiterate its strong support for

the conference proposal, on the basis of six basic principles: first, the strong opposition to and categorical rejection of Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, particularly the establishment of settlements; secondly, ending the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force; thirdly, the nullification and voidance of all legislative and administrative measures adopted by the occupying Power which have modified or attempted to modify the character and status of the City of Jerusalem; fourthly, the recognition of the right of the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*], the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing with other parties in all efforts to bring about peace in the region; fifthly, the realization by the Palestinian people of the inalienable right to self-determination, including the right to an independent homeland; and, lastly, the recognition of the right of all States in the region to an independent existence within secure and internationally recognized borders. These key elements, as embodied in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, remain the firm basis for any possible settlement of this question.

9. Since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the international community has continued its consideration of the question of Palestine. Both the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, and the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at its session held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, have reaffirmed their support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and reiterated their conviction that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East problem and the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict, a conflict whose solution must be comprehensive, just and lasting, based on the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and taking into account the interrelated character of the elements that constitute the problem.

10. In particular, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, as well as condemning

> "all manoeuvres and formulae aimed at preventing the people of Palestine from exercising their rights to self-determination, to achieve their national aspirations to return to their homeland and exercise their freedom and complete sovereignty",[2]

reiterated its firm support for the Arab peace plan, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[3] as

> "an important contribution to the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict; and [called] for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C on the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East".[2]

11. If the period of the past 36 years of dealing with the question has brought to light any reality it is that the challenge before the international community is an enormous one. It has also demonstrated that the solution to the Palestine problem will come about only if all aspects of the problem are taken into account, if the unity of those directly involved is restored and consolidated and if the close co-operation of those sincerely supporting the just cause of the Palestinian people is further strengthened. It is this challenge that we call upon the international community to face.

12. Mr. AL-OSTA (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Now that we are speaking once again in the General Assembly on the question of Palestine we know that all are aware that this question has already been discussed in all its aspects. All that one might say on the subject today has already been stated and restated tens if not hundreds of times over the past 37 years.

13. All delegations present are familiar with the actual situation in Palestine. Those delegations have been disappointed over the years and no longer believe in the ability of the United Nations to resolve international political problems, beginning with the question of Palestine.

14. My delegation deplores the unfortunate and serious situation in which the United Nations finds itself. We believe that responsibility lies squarely and primarily on the shoulders of the permanent members of the Security Council, who, up to the present, have been acting in a way that limits the Organization's ability to solve international problems. They defy the opinion of the majority of States Members of the United Nations and abuse the right of veto in the Security Council.

15. However, the delegation of Yemen would like to reaffirm its support for the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, as we also support the recommendations of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, and the Arab peace plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference.[3]

16. My delegation would like to reaffirm its clear and unwavering position regarding the question of Palestine. We believe that any just and equitable solution requires the total and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces from occupied Arab territory, including Jerusalem, and the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to the establishment of an independent State on its national soil, under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative. Any solution which fails to take those elements into consideration is doomed to failure.

17. We repeat our support for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties involved on an equal footing, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in order to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the problem.

18. It is high time for the international community to commit itself to putting an end to the arrogance and aggression of Israel. The time is ripe also for restoring to the Palestinian people its legitimate rights. It is the duty of those countries which support Israel, in particular the United States, which is supplying it with arms, funds and political, diplomatic and military support, to reconsider their position regarding Israel and its policy of aggression in the Middle East. We hope that the recent agreement concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the opening of negotiations without

pre-condition will make it possible to achieve solutions to all kinds of problems, not only those relating to disarmament; we are thinking first and foremost of the question of Palestine, the solution of which should be founded on a peaceful and just basis, in accordance with international law.

19. For Israel has never ceased to falsify historical facts and to justify its aggression and expansionism on the pretext of legitimate self-defence. The world today knows that the claims of Israel have no basis. We know that Israel, arrogantly and obstinately, defies the entire world.

20. We hope most sincerely to see the day when right will prevail and the Palestinian people will regain all of its legitimate rights, and we intend to work to that end. We hope to see the State of Palestine take its place among us as a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

21. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The position of Jordan with regard to the Palestinian problem is based on two fundamental elements: first, the continuance of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, including Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip, which is preventing the Arab Palestinian people from exercising its right to self-determination, and Israel's occupation and subsequent annexation of the Golan, which is a cause of continued tension and conflicts in the Middle East; and secondly, the reduction of tension and, in consequence, the attainment of peace in the Middle East, that most sensitive and vital region, which is today more than ever an international responsibility.

22. The history of the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories is well known to all. During the past 17 years, the true aggressive and expansionist intentions of Israel with regard to the Palestinian people and the West Bank and Gaza have become clear, in particular to the United Nations. In fact, no Israeli propaganda, whether about Israel's "desire" for peace or the "rejection" of peace by the Arabs, can any longer conceal the existence of a well-established Israeli plan and a co-ordinated policy for the Judaization of the West Bank and Gaza, just as occurred formerly in the case of Jerusalem and the Golan. Proof of this is that Israel is trying feverishly to create *faits accomplis* in the occupied territories, hoping thus to ensure the eventual transformation of the existence of Israel, at present based on force and aggression in these territories, into a "legitimate" existence in the future. That is why Israel is always using delaying tactics in order to gain time and resist all efforts to bring about peace. This is a reality that everybody must remember when the Palestinian question is being considered. The most dangerous thing of all is that Israel is a perpetual cause of tension and violence, so that it is impossible—and I mean quite impossible—to accept in any way this policy of *fait accompli* which Israel is trying to impose in the region. Peace at any price is an invitation to war—that has proved to be the lesson of the two world wars, from which humanity suffered so severely. I need not recall that Israel, basically, is now practising the philosophy of "peace at any price". Representatives will understand the seriousness of this attitude for world stability and security. Regardless of Israeli attempts to change the demographic and geographical character of these territories, the West Bank, including Jerusalem, with Gaza and the Golan, must be returned to Arab sovereignty. The more Israel steps up its establishment of settlements in these territories and its repressive practices against the Palestinian people, the more it increases the tension, violence and extremism in the region and, hence, the possibility of a world confrontation, which at present we could avert.

23. Israel's action in the occupied Arab territories and in the region reflects continued defiance of the principles of international law and is a source of violence and extremism. Its attitude in the United Nations and with regard to the efforts made within its framework, particularly by the Secretary-General, for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East is just as dangerous.

24. This is a brief summary of developments concerning the Palestinian problem since it was considered last year by the General Assembly. They culminated, on the one hand, in a renewal of Israeli efforts to entrench its occupation and try to transform it into a "legitimate" fact, and on the other, its disregard and rejection of peace efforts and its defiance of legitimacy and of the international consensus. There is no need to reaffirm the gravity of this situation for international peace and security.

25. In the light of all this, the position of Jordan has always been based on the fact that it is necessary to respect scrupulously the fundamental principles which govern the Arab-Israeli dispute and which international legitimacy has given concrete form in many serious situations and circumstances, and, in particular, in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). If we have accepted that resolution and called for its implementation, it is not because the resolution was based on a Jordanian demand but because it represents the basis for international unanimity and gives effect to principles accepted by the international community and by the Security Council, the international authority entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, and because it represents the basis for a lasting and just political solution in the Middle East, that is, "land in exchange for peace". The events that have taken place since the adoption of that resolution, particularly in 1973, have proved that the resolution continues to be the basis of the international consensus in favour of a political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The effect of this resolution can be seen in all the peace initiatives, whether from the Arab or any other side. These peace initiatives, all of which propose negotiations between the parties and have been rejected by Israel, have another political meaning. In addition to expressing the international will to find a political solution which could lead to a comprehensive, just and, consequently, lasting peace in the Middle East, these initiatives demonstrate the good will and desire for peace of the Arab side, which have accepted them in one form or another. They also show that the Arab side, including the Palestinian people and its representatives, take as their point of departure the principle of international legitimacy and what the international community has accepted as the basis for a settlement in the Middle East.

26. This means that the United Nations has the direct responsibility to take action, to go beyond the stage of the mere presentation of ideas and principles and to embark on the stage of the implementation of these principles. It is, moreover, the duty of us all to facilitate the task of the United Nations in this matter. For that reason, we in Jordan, together with the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, have sought to keep open all possibilities for achiev-

ing peace. In this regard, we stress the positive role played by our people living under occupation in maintaining an objective and balanced context for the Arab political initiative, of which Jordanian co-ordination with the PLO constitutes the essence and vanguard. Although they have been subjected to the most brutal forms of repression and terrorism designed to force them to abandon their land, our people have risen above their suffering and have placed themselves in an objective, well-balanced context that is given concrete form in the safeguarding of the national territory and of the Arab identity. In that framework, the Palestinian people has resisted the occupation and rejected all exhortations to extremism and all attempts to divide it, no matter what methods have been used for this purpose. We in Jordan have committed ourselves to respecting the conscience of our people and of our Arab Palestinian people living under occupation. We feel that this is the criterion for action on our part. We think that that is self-evident. There are some, however, who have acted as though the Palestinian people represented only a small group or a small number of individuals that could be used as a bargaining chip in the game of nations, within the context of an extremist and illogical approach, for which Israel is responsible and which has become the most effective means for implementing its expansionist and aggressive plans directed against the Arab nation. The will of our people under occupation has been the point of departure for and the fundamental criterion of our political action. In addition, the international community has agreed on a basis for a political solution, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions, which are binding in nature. Hence, we have done everything in our power and everything necessary to maintain the attachment of our Arab Palestinian people to its land. We have sought also to put that people's will and aspirations into concrete form. That is the reason for our co-ordination with the PLO in seeking an objective and shared notion in regard to the safeguarding of our territory. In fact, the Palestinian people has repeatedly reaffirmed both its Arab identity and its national identity. It has given concrete form to its Arab identity by firmly maintaining Jordanian-Palestinian unity, based on a single glorious history and on suffering shared today, and on their belief in a future of unity which, no matter how long it takes to achieve, will constitute an outstanding page in its history. Its national identity is reflected in an indestructible will and in independent decision-making. We in Jordan are very much aware of this; we experience it every day. The children of the Palestinian people demonstrated their dedication to unity in 1950, despite the manoeuvres engaged in by several enemies of Arab unity to undermine it. That is why the Arab Palestinian people under occupation has proposed an approach for international political action that can put an end to its tragic situation. It has proved to the international community that it is faithful to its heritage and its identity, and it has sought objective action based on the international consensus for the attainment of peace between the Arabs and Israel. It has also reaffirmed that sincere action on the Palestinian question requires an appeal for Arab unanimity and unity, not division. That was the framework for the Jordanian dialogue with the PLO, which gave concrete form to the agreement by both sides on the need to put an end to occupation and to regain the Arab territories, beginning with Jerusalem, as well as to co-ordinate the efforts of the Palestinian people to preserve its national future.

27. What I have just said constitutes only a part of the basic elements of our political existence, of the experience of unity of the Jordanian people that lives under occupation, just as does its ally, the Palestinian people, in a spirit of a sacred united destiny. The Palestinian people has shown its dedication to unity as a national value and objective and as an essential and effective guarantee of the restoration of its national rights in Palestine. We in Jordan cannot but share the suffering of the Palestinian people under the yoke of occupation. I say this only to point out that in undertaking our political initiative we had in mind, above all, the suffering of the Arab Palestinian people and our responsibility towards them. The Jordanians are a proud people. They are defending and will defend their nation, no matter what sacrifices must be made. We want our people to be liberated; we want to safeguard them, not to increase their suffering. We do not want this suffering to be handed down to future generations. We want our children to inherit, at least, the results of our objective action, healthy and rational concepts, if we are not able to hand down to them peace, hope and development.

28. That is the context of Jordan's political action, as reflected in the peace efforts and initiatives, as well as in the call for an international conference in which all the parties involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict would participate and which would make it possible for the Palestinian people to choose its representatives in all freedom. That was the commitment we in Jordan undertook when we declared our acceptance of the resolution adopted by the seventh Conference of Arab Heads of State or Government, held at Rabat in 1974, and when we began a dialogue with the PLO. We did this because it was the wish of our people in the West Bank and Gaza, a wish reiterated very clearly this year and quite recently again during the meeting of the Palestine National Council, at Amman. The unity of the Jordanian and Palestinian peoples is a sacred historical fact, and Jordan's co-operation with the PLO must serve to crystallize a common political concept whose point of departure is an irrefutable and non-negotiable principle: Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, in exchange for recognition and the security of all the States of the region and their peoples. That is why we regard this co-operation as the means for crystallizing the freely expressed will of the Palestinian people, as well as the basis for political action. Hence, we have given full latitude to the PLO to decide the position it wishes to take, a position dictated by its national obligations and by the suffering that has been endured by the Palestinian people. King Hussein announced in his opening statement to the seventeenth session of the Palestine National Council, at Amman, that Jordan would accept the decision taken by the PLO in this regard. The Palestinian people, having reaffirmed its freely expressed will and its desire for national unity, expects reciprocity from us. It expects that we will be sincere and will shoulder our responsibilities.

29. We in Jordan have always believed in these ideals. We have always implemented them, and we have no doubt that they will be a major factor in any political action by the PLO, the representative of that people. Similarly, under the yoke of occupation the

Palestinian people has expressed Jordanian-Palestinian unity—past, present and future. In presenting its liberation as a national imperative, it appealed to the Arab nation to close ranks so as to achieve its salvation. Our Arab Palestinian people launched the same appeal to the international community in order to awaken the world's conscience to seek action based on justice, objectivity and even-handedness. The Palestinians have sought peace; they are resisting occupation by all the modest means at their disposal. The moderation they have shown, together with their legitimate resistance and the pursuit of their struggle, can form the basis for an honourable way out of the current deadlock. While the Palestinian people's moderation and its acceptance of the international community's verdict enhance United Nations efforts for the establishment of a comprehensive, lasting and just peace in the Middle East, the just struggle of the people and its insistence on justice will not allow the world to forget its suffering and, later, to fall into the trap of a guilt complex. Quite frankly, today we can see that the Arab Palestinian people is providing the international community, through its struggle and its moderation, with an opportunity to avoid what could bring us all to fall into that trap in future.

30. Furthermore, I wish to stress that Jordanian-Palestinian political action is encountering many difficulties and obstacles, in particular from Israel, which did not even allow representatives of the West Bank members of the Palestine National Council to participate in that Council's meeting in order to take their own decision with regard to establishing and maintaining peace. Israel's attitude has also been negative with regard to the proposed peace conference endorsed by the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General's efforts towards its realization. That conference, which has been called a "peace conference", provides an opportunity to uphold the legitimate requirements of the two parties to the conflict: Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories and the implementation of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, on the one hand, and security for and recognition of Israel, on the other.

31. I shall not speak of the inhuman and illegal Israeli practices against the Arab Palestinian people in the occupied Arab territories. The file on such acts perpetrated by Israel led to the General Assembly declaring, in 1982, that Israel is not a peace-loving State. If Israel truly wished peace, it could today take the initiative so as to demonstrate its good will. It could stop the process of Judaization of the occupied Arab territories, recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, put an end to its expansionist acts of sabotage in the region and stop its policy of hegemony and resort to force, including the total militarization of Israeli society and the creation of a dangerous situation of international polarization. Should Israel refuse to take the initiative and create a climate of détente, the United Nations and, in particular, the members of the Security Council have a special responsibility *vis-à-vis* the Palestinian people and the establishment of peace and the maintenance of security and stability. If Israel continues to resist the establishment of peace, the United Nations should then seek to impose it, otherwise the Organization—the hope of mankind—could fall victim to intransigence, extremism and aggression.

32. The United Nations has not been able up to now to play its role as it should. Since those who have tried on their own to contribute to the achievement of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East have not succeeded, it might prove more productive for them to make their contribution through the United Nations in order to ensure the timely achievement of this noble, and necessary, goal. As a super-Power, the United States has a special responsibility with regard to peace, and it must hasten to shoulder that responsibility. That its bilateral efforts have not been fruitful is perhaps because it has chosen to stand at the side of one of the parties to the conflict instead of playing the role of neutral mediator. Israel has exploited its special and privileged relationship with the United States for its own ends. Hence, it has become clear—and this is not a source of satisfaction to any of us—that the United States has lost on both sides, while Israel has benefited to the extent of the United States loss. The United States, which has invested considerably in Israel under the pretext that such action could make Israel more forthcoming and less intransigent and extremist, has lost not only its investments but also its political influence in its relations with the Israeli leadership. This unlimited material and political support given to Israel by the United States has undermined the reputation and credibility of the United States throughout the Arab world and internationally, whereas it could have been placed at the service of a constructive and even-handed American role in the region. I do not intend to go into details and give data on the unbalanced relationship between the United States and Israel. However, it is clear that it not only runs counter to United States interests but also undermines regional peace and stability. If it is true that the United States believes its support for Israel—which remains intransigent, irreducible and expansionist—has priority over its international responsibilities, we are indeed faced with an extremely difficult situation. If the United States believes that Israel's security must be at the basis of its policy in the Middle East and takes the necessary steps to implement such a policy, the Arabs are then constrained to look to the defence of their very existence and to safeguard their legitimate rights.

33. It is not at all satisfactory for the United Nations to be brought to the point of having to beg a super-Power to respond to the efforts for the convening of an international conference and to support the request made to Israel in this connection. The United States is a super-Power and quite capable of defending its own legitimate interests both within and outside the United Nations. Hence, I do not believe that its participation, together with the international community, in the establishment of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East could be less important and less effective in the long term than its unilateral achievement of that goal.

34. We are aware of the difficulties inherent in the mission the General Assembly has conferred upon the Secretary-General to pursue his efforts for the convening of an international peace conference which could serve as the framework for negotiations to arrive at agreements ensuring the peace and security of all States and peoples in the region and recognizing their existence. Israel has demonstrated its intransigence and inflexibility; furthermore, there is a lack of enthusiasm on the part of a great Power and inability to act on the part of the Security Council and other international bodies. Proceeding

to take action can come about only from our own will and our faith in the future, and I believe that we must have recourse to these two primary factors in these difficult times, when we must mobilize our efforts and demonstrate our firm resolve to achieve peace between the Arabs and Israel based on justice and international legitimacy.

35. Today, the Assembly heard a statement by the representative of Israel [94th meeting]: the least that can be said about it is that it failed on two counts: first, because it was not in keeping with the objectives of peace and security that the United Nations is seeking to achieve in the Middle East; and, secondly, because it was essentially based on a set of falsifications and inexactitudes well known to all. It seems that the new Israeli representative wanted to outdo his predecessor in falsifying facts and in advancing new theories. But it is obvious that he cannot do better than his predecessor in the field of international law. Hence, he chose another field, a more general field—that of international relations—and attempted to advance new theories on war and peace, on the history of the United Nations, on peoples and national ethnic groups.

36. I really do not feel obliged to respond to all the inexactitudes in the statement of the Israeli representative; his affirmations speak for themselves. I shall confine myself to making a few general observations. Israel's responsibility with regard to the 1967 war is now clearly established and well documented. The Arab States did not take the initiative of attacking Israel. Indeed, it was Israel which, before the war had begun, declared that it would attack Syria and occupy Damascus in order to overthrow the Government. Many historians, politicians and jurists have stated that it was Israel which put forward war plans so as to create an explosive situation in the region, as *The Observer* reported on 5 June 1967.

37. I shall not elaborate on the theory of Israel's security, based on sudden and preventive strikes and invasion under the pretext of legitimate defence. The principle of legitimate defence has been distorted, just as the principles of international law have been trampled upon, principles which Israel made nothing more than a "clearing-house" to justify its aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. In his statement, the Israeli representative spoke of the 1967 war and other wars unleashed by Israel against its Arab neighbours, as well as claims calling for the West Bank from now on to be called Judea and Samaria. If Israel considers that the West Bank represents only Judea and Samaria, it should not be surprised if Arabs resort to war to liberate their territory. I believe that the explanation of the 1967 war and the Israeli threats that preceded it show Israel's determination to hold on to the West Bank, Jerusalem, Gaza and the Golan Heights. Of course, the justifications of the Talmud and the weak pretext of security still continue.

38. The Israeli representative would have the victorious take everything, with the vanquished having no other choice but surrender. If that is Israel's approach with regard to the question of Palestine, and in dealing with the United Nations in particular, I do not believe that it would be useful to hear the Israeli representative speak in this body where justice is done to the oppressed and where peace and justice throughout the world are sought.

39. The Israeli representative denied the existence of the problem of the occupied Arab territories and the existence of the refugee problem, placing responsibility for the problem on Arab leaders. If Israel is not responsible for the refugee problem, even though it was Israel which perpetrated the Deir Yassin and Qibya massacres, followed in 1948 by a propaganda campaign against the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza, threatening them with the same fate as that of the massacred inhabitants of those two villages; if Israel is not responsible for the exodus of two million Palestinian refugees since 1948 and if that exodus was not an Israeli aim, then let Israel simply allow them to return. Since their return would pose no problem to Israel, would it not be logical for Israel to authorize this return?

40. Why does Israel ask the Arabs to take care of the refugees while Israel itself bears the political and moral consequences of the destruction of the Palestinian people's national identity, instead of accepting them and accepting their return to their homeland, from which they were expelled?

41. As I have already said, in the statement made this morning by the Israeli representative, there were numerous inexactitudes and half-truths. Proof of that can be seen in his attempt to distort not only history but also geography and the existence and national identity of the Arab nation. For him, the Palestinian people does not exist; Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan; the Jordanian people does not exist in the Israeli representative's vocabulary. It is inadmissible that the Israeli representative should seek to impose on the Arab nation his own definition of its national identity and of the relationships among the Arab peoples themselves, forgetting that Israel is made up of colonizers that have come from the four corners of the world—the followers of the racist philosophy or ideology of zionism—to chase away the entire Arab people and attempt to establish hegemony over the entire region.

42. Finally, the Israeli representative this morning tried very hard but wasted the valuable time of members by citing various statements made by Arab leaders requesting what he called the "destruction of Israel". Indeed, that is a game Israeli spokesmen love to play, because it serves Israel's goals in struggling against peace. However, the Israeli representative made sure not to refer to Arab appeals for peace, in particular those made by Jordan and by King Hussein. That illustrates just how much credibility can be ascribed to the Israeli representative's statement, and this credibility vanishes when we consider that he was not even accurate in his references. In mentioning the radio message addressed by King Hussein to the Arab army defending the City of Jerusalem during the June war, he distorted that message in such a way as to serve his interests, to give rise to anti-religious, fanatic and extremist feelings. The Israeli representative quoted the message as follows: "Kill the Jews wherever you find them. Kill them with your arms, with your hands, with your nails and with your teeth."*

43. In fact, what King Hussein said was "Fight them", that is to say, "Fight the enemy", and not "Kill them", as distorted by the Israeli representative. King Hussein quoted the text of a verse of the Koran prohibiting war on civilians—women, chil-

---

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

dren and the elderly—those whom Israel did not spare in its siege of Beirut.

44. As for the old song "Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is part of Jordan", I do not know how the Israeli representative dares to mention it while endeavouring to prove Israel's innocence and its lack of responsibility with regard to the Palestinian problem. The Israeli representative is perfectly aware that there are geographical and historical hard facts outside the expansionist and false notions of the Israelis.

45. Jordan belongs to the Jordanians and Palestine to the Palestinians, and no one has the right to decide the identity and the homeland of a people whose roots go back thousands of years in the land of its ancestors, as is the case for the two brother peoples, Palestinians and Jordanians. The Palestinian people does not seek to establish its homeland where it happens to be living. That is characteristic of colonialists, which is in fact in keeping with the universal Zionist philosophy on which Israel is based and which seeks unscrupulously for space, even if that space belongs to others.

46. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): The Palestinian question is one of the biggest challenges the international community is facing today. It has already triggered five devastating conflicts and still continues to be a threat to international peace and security. The Palestinian tragedy began when the General Assembly decided to give the best part of Palestine, against the will of the people who had inhabited the land since time immemorial, to Jewish immigrants coming from every culture and clime. The world community was still under the shock of Nazi horrors when it decided to establish in Palestine a homeland for the victims of the holocaust, without prejudice, as it was believed, to the interests of Palestinian Arabs.

47. Unfortunately, however, the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine to be a haven for Jews in the Diaspora entailed the dispossession and dispersion of the Palestinian people. As the Zionists were campaigning before the creation of Israel, they wanted to give credibility to the preposterous assumption that Palestine was not inhabited. The terrorism and the massacre that heralded the establishment of Israel drove the Palestinians into exile, a process which, sadly, has continued until today. The United Nations was not indifferent to the Palestinian plight. The General Assembly, in adopting resolution 194 (III), affirmed the right of the dispersed Palestinians to return to their homeland and recover their usurped properties. Israel refused then, and continues to defy any attempt by the international community, to redress the injustice it perpetrates against the Palestinian people.

48. Today, the overwhelming majority of the international community has recognized the centrality of the Palestinian question to the conflicts and persistent tension in the Middle East. No one in his or her right mind will deny the legitimacy of the struggle undertaken by the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, to assert its right to return to its homeland, its right to self-determination, to independence and to establish its sovereign State on its national soil. These are the inalienable rights to which every people in the world is entitled. The Palestinians are not asking for more or for less: they are asking for their rightful place in the sun.

49. But, throughout its existence, Israel has negated not only the national rights of the Palestinian people but its very existence. As is well known, Israel's main preoccupation all along has been the evacuation of Palestinian inhabitants from the occupied territories for eventual annexation. The most effective tactic that the occupation authorities are resorting to in their endeavour to expel the inhabitants from their ancestral homeland is the programme of settlement and colonization. The malignant proliferation of settlements in the occupied territories is deeply affecting the economic and social life of the population. Every colonial settlement that is established near a Palestinian village or township is always intended to strangle the latter by diverting water resources and energy. The process of settlement continues at an accelerated pace to meet the quota of 100,000 Jewish settlers by 1985, thus modifying the demographic composition of the occupied territories. While these settlements put heavy strains on the living conditions of the Arab population, the settlers, armed by the occupation authorities, commit outright acts of aggression against them. As we all know, educational institutions are subjected to armed attacks by State-sponsored terrorism; public transport is bombed; houses are demolished; and even the sanctity of places of worship is violated, as in the case of the attempt to blow up the Al-Aqsa and Omar Mosques, setting fire to the Saaddin Mosque in Nablus and the assault on the Ibrahimi Mosque in Hebron.

50. While the Palestinian Arabs are subjected to daily harassments, any protest on their part will be met by harsh measures. Collective punishment, curfews, arbitrary detention and expulsion, torture and even murder are the order of the day in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. All these tactics are meant to make life so insecure and unbearable for the Palestinian and Arab inhabitants that they prefer to emigrate rather than live in Palestine.

51. Every Israeli attempt to obliterate the Palestinian national identity has ended in failure. The Palestinian nation is one of the oldest in the world, and history testifies to the continuity of Palestinians in Palestine since time immemorial, during which they have produced a particular national, artistic and legislative system that determines the existence of a specific national community which in turn is part of a larger Arab national community. It was a vindication of this historical continuity of the Palestinians when the League of Nations, in 1921, years before Israel was established, recognized the Palestinian national community.

52. Israel can massacre the Palestinians, expel them, confiscate their properties, usurp the cultural patrimony, desecrate their places of worship and cultural landmarks, and deny them their fundamental human rights, but it will never be able to destroy their spirit of resistance, their aspirations and their national will, which are the continuity of their history. Israel knows this better than any other. Ever since the Palestinians chose the PLO as their sole representative, the Zionist authorities have been haunted by the spectre of ever-growing Palestinian nationalism.

53. The unwarranted invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and the carnage and destruction it brought about were perpetrated with the sole purpose of physically liquidating the PLO and burying with it the hopes and national aspirations of the Palestinian people

under the rubble of Beirut. The PLO survived the test more determined than ever to continue the struggle for national independence.

54. The Palestinian leadership has once more demonstrated its political and diplomatic acumen at the beginning of this year when it was faced with a critical situation. The meeting of the Palestine National Council at Amman removed any doubts that might have been entertained in some quarters. The Amman meeting demonstrated to the world that the PLO represents not only the Palestinians in exile but also the Palestinians living in Palestine.

55. The primary responsibility of the United Nations is to find peaceful solutions for conflicts that might threaten international peace and security. The Palestinian question could trigger another conflagration at any moment. Today, the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations believe that the convening of an international conference on the Middle East would provide the most appropriate avenue leading towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

56. Next year, the United Nations is to mark its fortieth anniversary. It will be an occasion for celebration, but it will also be a moment of retrospection and assessment of the achievements and failures of the Organization. The United Nations could have no better present for the world on that occasion than a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

57. Finally, I would like to pay tribute and express my appreciation to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which, under the competent and able leadership of Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, has spared no effort in enhancing international awareness of and support for the struggle of the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and to establish an independent and sovereign Palestinian State. I commend the Committee's excellent report [*A/39/35*], which it has diligently prepared to highlight the legitimacy of the struggle of the Palestinian people, with which my delegation fully concurs. In this regard, my delegation hopes that the Committee's findings and recommendations enjoy the full support of the international community.

58. Mr. OCHIENGHS-WELLBORN (Uganda): My delegation has read attentively the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*ibid.*] and the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/130 and Add.1*]. I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Sarré, of Senegal, and the members of the Committee for their untiring efforts to fulfil the mandate entrusted to them by the General Assembly. Our appreciation goes equally to the Secretary-General, who over the past year has exerted considerable efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Middle East.

59. The problem of Palestine has been one of the most urgent recurrent concerns of the United Nations ever since its inception. The item has remained prominent on the agenda of successive sessions of the General Assembly and other international forums. This is only right, because the failure to resolve it is the main cause of the conflict in the Middle East, which constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security.

60. When the General Assembly grappled with this issue in 1947, it recognized the necessity of establishing a Palestinian Arab State. General Assembly resolution 181 (II), of 29 November 1947, from which Israel derives it existence, required the establishment of a Palestinian State. By that resolution, the international community undertook the obligation to ensure the establishment of a Palestinian State. Accordingly, contingent upon the admission of Israel to the United Nations was the requirement that it would abide by the United Nations partition plan. It was not the intention of the United Nations that the establishment of an Israeli State should result in injustice for the Palestinian people. They are now unfortunately being denied their inalienable rights. They are being forced to live in perpetual exile or suffer oppression under foreign occupation.

61. The main obstacle to the realization of a Palestinian State and a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict has been and remains Israeli intransigence. The Israeli objectives have been obvious for many years, though they have been masked under various guises. These objectives are: to integrate the occupied Arab territories within Israel, while finding a way of reducing the Arab population; to disperse the scattered Palestinian refugees and crush any manifestation of Palestinian nationalism or culture; and to gain control over southern Lebanon.

62. They have consistently rejected any political settlement that accommodates the inalienable rights of the indigenous population. Israel has sought to achieve its objectives through repression and State terrorism and to hoodwink the international community by a massive propaganda campaign which has long distorted the true nature of the question of Palestine.

63. Right from its establishment, Israel embarked on policies and actions aimed at preventing the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 181 (II); it immediately set out to expand beyond the boundaries allocated to it under the United Nations partition plan. Through aggressive actions and wars, Israel has been swallowing up more Palestinian and other Arab lands with the clear aim of preventing the Palestinian people from regaining their inalienable rights. Since 1967, the Israeli goal has been to consolidate its hold on the occupied lands. The implanting of numerous massive settlements is the main technique of converting conquest to annexation.

64. Annexation, expansion and the creation of settlements are contrary to international law. Article 47 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, expressly proscribes the annexation of occupied territory. Article 49 prohibits the forcible deportation or transfer of the inhabitants of the occupied area. It also forbids the transfer by an occupying Power of any of its population into the occupied areas. Yet, in spite of the condemnation of the United Nations and its injunctions, Israel has continued to violate these provisions and has refused to rescind its actions.

65. Despite attempts to misrepresent the facts, many Israeli leaders have never hidden their real objectives. In a lecture at Hebrew University in May 1980, a former Israeli intelligence officer, General Gazit, warned against evacuating any part of historic Eretz Yisrael, which must remain entirely under Jewish control and basically a Jewish State. Referring

to the Arab indigenous inhabitants of those territories, he said: "The solution for them must be found outside historic Israel."

66. The report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [*A/39/591*] gives the most recent examples of how Israel is altering the legal status, geographic nature and demographic character of the Arab territories occupied since 1967. It has adamantly refused to recognize the applicability of the 1949 Geneva Convention to the occupied territories. Viewed against the background of the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, the annexation of Jerusalem, the barbaric invasion and subsequent occupation of southern Lebanon, the avowed aim of which was to destroy the PLO, it becomes clear that Israel intends to annex the West Bank and Gaza in its quest for a greater Israel. It appears that the only kind of peace Israel desires, and is intent on imposing on the region, is one that denies the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and rules out the possibility of any comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East conflict.

67. Israel has always sought to put an end to the Palestinian national identity; but the history of the past four decades shows that the Palestinians are capable of making splendid sacrifices in order to maintain their national Palestinian identity and achieve the restoration of their inalienable rights. This was aptly demonstrated by the failure of the Israeli onslaught on Palestinians in the recent invasion of Lebanon to extinguish the spirit of freedom that inspires their liberation struggle. In spite of vicious attacks against them and their dispersal from Beirut, their struggle continues unabated and is supported by the overwhelming majority of the international community.

68. The PLO has proved beyond any shadow of doubt that it is the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. It emerged from the Israeli onslaught with its stature and political influence enhanced. It remains the true representative of the Palestinian people.

69. The West Bank population rejected the village leagues which the Israeli authorities were attempting to foist on them. It is clear that those who seek a peaceful resolution to the Middle East conflict must be prepared to talk to and negotiate with the PLO. It is unfortunate that Israel and one reputable Member of the United Nations still refuse to accept this reality. We believe that an acceptance of this truth by all would contribute positively to the peace process. It would discourage Israeli intransigence.

70. In our view, Israeli opposition to the PLO and Israel's adamant refusal to allow it a place at the peace negotiating table are not because of any provision in the PLO covenant. Israel opposes the PLO because it is the living expression of Palestinian nationalism and champions their inalienable rights, which Israel seeks to destroy.

71. David Krivine, in a letter to *The Economist* of 10 July 1982, gave the real reason why Israel objects to any discussion with the PLO. He said:

> "The one group we won't talk with, it is true, is the PLO—but not because they are nasty people. The obstacle is the subject on the agenda. It can only be the creation of a Palestinian State on the West Bank, and that we can't agree to."

72. We ask those who refuse to talk to the PLO on the basis of this erroneous reason to challenge Israel as to whether it would be prepared to accept a Palestinian State, as called for in United Nations resolutions, if that condition were met.

73. The Israeli response to all peace proposals from any quarter which are aimed at achieving a just solution that takes into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinians has been negative and provocative. This is in contrast with the positive response of the PLO and Arab countries. In spite of Israeli provocations, they have been flexible. They have stood by the plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,[3] under which all States in the region could coexist within secure and internationally recognized borders. Unfortunately, under the mask of the right to live within secure borders, Israel has obdurately refused to recognize the Palestinian right to self-determination and to enter into a dialogue involving the PLO.

74. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1982, called for an international peace conference on the Middle East. The General Assembly, in resolution 38/58 C, endorsed that recommendation and mandated the Secretary-General to make arrangements for the convening of the conference. We believe that that resolution provided good machinery for building a just and lasting settlement. Regrettably, Israel continues to put road-blocks in the way of the convening of the conference. We appeal to all concerned to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to facilitate the convening of the conference. As the previous peace conference, in December 1973, of which the United States and the Soviet Union were co-chairmen, demonstrated, such a forum would enhance the chance of success of the peace process in the region.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the Chair.

75. The main elements of a just solution to the Palestinian question, which is the core of the Middle East conflict, are present in a number of United Nations resolutions. A framework for peace must be just and comprehensive. It can be comprehensive and just only if it restores the rights of the Palestinian people and involves the participation of all the parties concerned. It must include the following elements: first, the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories; secondly, recognition of the right of refugees to return to their homeland; and, thirdly, the exercise by the Palestinians of the right to self-determination.

76. The PLO, which is the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinians, must participate in the negotiations.

77. In a message addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People on 29 November 1984, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, the President of Uganda, Mr. A. Milton Obote, stated:

> "On this solemn occasion when we observe the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, I wish to convey to you the commitment of the Government of the Republic of Uganda and the people of Uganda to work towards the rehabilitation and enjoyment of the full rights of the Palestinian people.

> "The Palestinians have the right to return to their homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to set up an independent State of their own. There can never be just and durable peace in the Middle East without addressing the injustice done to the Palestinians."

78. I wish on behalf of the Government and people of Uganda to reaffirm the commitment made by President Obote.

79. Mr. **RAJAIE-KHORASSANI** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I will begin with some very relevant verses from the Holy Koran. I take refuge in God, away from the accursed Satan.

> "Verily God will defend (from ill) those who believe: verily, God loveth not any that is a traitor to faith, or shows ingratitude.
>
> "To those against whom war is made, permission is given (to fight), because they are wronged;—and verily, God is most powerful for their aid;—
>
> "(They are) those who have been expelled from their homes in defiance of right,"—that applies to the Palestinians, does it not?—"(for no cause) except that they say, 'Our Lord is God'. Did not God check one set of people by means of another, there would surely have been pulled down monasteries, churches, synagogues, and mosques, in which the name of God is commemorated in abundant measure. God will certainly aid those who aid His (cause);—for verily God is full of strength, exalted in might (able to enforce His will).
>
> "(They are) those who, if we establish them in the land, establish regular prayer and give regular charity, enjoin the right and forbid wrong: with God rests the end (and decision) of (all) affairs." [*Surah XXII:38-41.*]

80. About four decades have passed since the occupation of Palestine, and the Palestinian people are still as displaced and homeless as ever. The Zionist usurpers of Palestine, with the unreserved support of the United States, are still taking hostage the entire nation of Palestine and are threatening the rest of the area. As members know, southern Lebanon has been added to the occupied territories. In spite of all the support and sympathy that the voting records have always demonstrated for Palestine, the United Nations has not so far been able to liberate one inch of the occupied land. It has been only a helpless spectator of the continuation of occupation, further illegal settlements, expansion of aggression, occupation of further territories and devastation of more residential areas.

81. Zionist dreams of occupation from the Nile to the Euphrates are coming closer to realization with the recent developments in the area; the Camp David conspiracy is gaining more recognition. After Jordan's green light, Iraq is now giving the green light. *The Washington Post* of 28 November 1984 has quoted Tariq Aziz as saying that "his nation will not oppose possible efforts by Jordan and the Palestinians to forge a peace agreement with Israel". "Israel," he continues, "is guilty of aggression against Lebanon, the Palestinians and Jordan, but Iraq has no right to veto a peace movement." Strange, isn't it? To give full assurance to those concerned, he says: "I say officially, we will not oppose it even if we don't like it. We have to consider it from the realistic point of view." That is how the Zionist dream of "from the Nile to the Euphrates" is gradually coming true and that is how the cause of Palestine is being raped by its once adamant supporters, namely, Egypt and Iraq. Quite regrettable, isn't it? It is good to remember that Iraq severed its relations with the United States Government simply because of the latter's support for Israel. The same champion is now considering a Palestinian-Jordan peace treaty with the Zionist aggressor "from a realistic point of view".

82. Thus the Camp David conspiracy is enjoying more and more accommodation, so to speak, and receptivity, simply because the United Nations has not been able to seek even to implement justice in the cause of Palestine. Even General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, endorsing the call for an international peace conference on the Middle East, which was expected to serve the Palestine cause, was so easily exploited by the enemies of Palestine simply because, under the guise of seeking provision for agreement with the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights[1]—adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983—the matter was referred to the Security Council. Of course, the outcome in the Security Council was already known beforehand: the negative vote of the United States on resolution 38/58 C clearly presaged the veto in the Security Council. In his letter of 13 January 1984, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United States said:

> "The United States believes firmly that the only path to peace in the Middle East lies in a process of negotiations among the parties based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, a process that the United States has sought vigorously and consistently to encourage, particularly in the Camp David accords and in President Reagan's initiative of 1 September 1982. Holding an international conference as recommended by the General Assembly would only hinder this process. It would predictably become a forum for propagandistic and extreme positions, and in the context proposed by the General Assembly and further articulated by the Secretary-General it would very likely yield a one-sided outcome not acceptable to one or more of the parties and therefore inoperable. The net result would be to diminish the prestige of the United Nations as the sponsor of the conference"—some people care so much about the prestige of the United Nations—"and delay the day when peace will come to the troubled Middle East." [*A/39/130, annex III, appendix.*]

You see, according to this text, peace can be achieved only when the base of imperialism and zionism is fully installed and imposed upon the people. They have to accept it, to swallow it, because the United States wishes it to be so. Otherwise, there can be no peace—from its point of view.

83. The meaning of an international conference in which the Governments that are directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict—namely, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria—are invited to a negotiating table is fairly clear. By "fairly clear", I mean that such a conference could again be exploited by some as a forum for direct negotiations. My delegation is quite sure that even if the idea had not been vetoed by the United States, the very fact that the Zionist base of terror would attend the conference on an equal footing with other countries would have been a concession to the Zionist enemy, and as such a setback for the cause of Palestine. Notwithstanding this

fact, the efforts of the United Nations for even a concessionary peace conference were vetoed by the United States.

84. If the same request for a peace conference is made and our Palestinian brothers vote for it, we shall follow them because we shall always co-operate with the cause of Palestine. But, in this instance, this spirit of co-operation is not fully in accordance with our spirit.

85. In such circumstances, serious consideration must be given to whether to count on the diplomatic front and whether the international forum is really advisable at all.

86. The basic problem in the Palestinian tragedy is the misunderstanding, and consequently the misrepresentation, of the problem. The problem is that the United Nations has given recognition and legitimacy to the occupation of Palestine, and so long as this mistake is not rectified, one will always confront a political situation in which the culprit and those behind it participate in making decisions for the victim. It is not very difficult to predict the decisions of a United Nations with such an absurd composition. When the burglar becomes the arbiter, obviously the victim becomes the culprit.

87. A more fundamental aspect of the problem, which I wish to address to my brothers in the delegations of the Muslim countries, stems from the fact that the occupation of Palestine by the Zionist enemy is an Islamic issue. Islamic territory has been attacked and occupied. The Muslim nation of Palestine has been subjected to aggression, homelessness, displacement, murder and massive genocide—not once, not twice, not three times, but continuously over the past four decades. Instead of undertaking our religious duty of collectively defending Palestine, we have simply secularized the matter and relegated it to a secular body, where the enemy has the power of manipulation and control. We cannot discharge our responsibilities by simply secularizing the matter of Palestine and hurling the issues at a secular playing-field. It is not by appealing to obscenity that anyone—and definitely not the Muslims in the General Assembly—can unburden himself of the Muslims' collective religious duties. Otherwise, we shall be, as we are now, left with the choice of abdicating to the incompetent our most serious concerns, such as Palestine. On what grounds can we Muslim nations expect a secular body to renounce its own artificial baby? On what grounds can we Muslim countries expect the United Nations to come and liberate our sanctuaries? On what moral, religious or even secular grounds can we expect the General Assembly to return the holy Al-Quds or the Al-Aqsa Mosque to us? Such an expectation is really absurd and inadmissible. The General Assembly is not going to do it, and we all know that it is not going to do it.

88. Either one is honest with the cause of Islam, with the cause of Palestine, or one wishes to nationalize Islam and secularize the masses of the Islamic Ummah and leave their destiny to the hands of one's Zionist enemies. If one really wants to be honest with the cause of Palestine, then one should take it as it really is. Palestine is an Islamic territory and Palestinians are a part of the Islamic Ummah. It is therefore the duty of all Muslims to mobilize all their capabilities, under the banner of Islam, for the liberation of occupied Palestine and the implementation of justice. And it is wrong to assume that Palestinians must defend and suffer but others can only support, by pushing the green button in favour of a silly draft resolution. It is equally incumbent upon all Muslims to defend Palestine.

89. If Muslims decide to nationalize Palestine and secularize their Islamic duties, then all Muslims deserve the humiliation of defeat, not only in the area, but particularly in this forum, which is, after all, a secular international club that belongs to the others and not to Muslims.

90. There is no solution to the problem of Palestine in this international body. Its so-called solution would only add to our agony, because the best they can offer is the partition plan, which installed the enemy centre in our region and annihilated our Palestine. The solution of the Islamic problem cannot be a secular one from a secular source. Our position has always been that only a united Islamic front can liberate Palestine. Zionist hegemony cannot be halted or undone by those instruments in which Zionists themselves have a role. As a matter of fact, it is the desire of the Zionists to see you, here, adopt their language, define your problems according to their categories and seek their solution to your problems. For in every step by which you accommodate something of the enemy's you have already suffered a set-back. You are therefore the loser even when you are the winner.

91. You have been the victim of aggression, you have been wronged. You have the divine mandate to defend yourself. Why do you not do it? You have divine support in defending yourself.

92. Surely, God will defend those who believe. Surely, God does not love the ungrateful traitor. Leave is given to those who fight because they were wronged, and surely God is able to help them. Therefore, we have to defend ourselves. We have to make sure that we do not betray the law of God. Do not be a traitor to Islam. Defend yourself on the basis of the divine mandate. God is able to help those who were unrightfully expelled from their homes. This applies to the Palestinians, does it not?

93. Then the verse says this. Had God not driven back the people, some by the means of others? There have been cloisters and churches, oratories and mosques, destroyed. Do members not think that all this is taking place inside the occupied lands? Are not mosques and sanctuaries being devastated, changed, destroyed? There are even resolutions to that effect. God will indeed help, but we have to move, too. It is our duty to drive back those who have come to destroy cloisters, sanctuaries and mosques wherein divine names are to be recited. Remember that God will help him who helps God.

94. The enemy is very weak indeed. Do not fear him. He has no power when one stands. Do not be astounded by his technology. Those who stand firm and united will be victorious. In the words of the Koran: "And if the fly should snatch away anything from them, they would have no power to release it from the fly" [*Surah XXII:73*]. They are very small, very miserable. Do not give a lot of weight to their technology. It is ultimately the human mind which acts and makes the decision, not the technology. All that we have to do is to obey the divine prescriptions, which say: "And hold fast, all together, by the rope which God (stretches out for you), and be not divided among yourselves" [*Surah III:103*]; and: "Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your

power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies of God and your enemies, . . . " [*Surah VIII:60*].

95. Experience will show, and has already shown, that a small, united, faithful Muslim group can defeat the Zionist enemy. The enemy has been so well defeated for the first time in Lebanon that withdrawal is its only choice and it is trying to find a face-saving solution. It can be imagined, then, what will happen if only the Muslims of the Middle East unify against the enemy and mobilize all their resources.

96. It should be well remembered that the solutions of the international body are inevitably divisive and competitive because they are based on divisive presuppositions, whereas Islam is unifying and uniting because it is based on Tawhid. Islamic unity is the only solution. Palestine cannot be liberated by anything less than the divine dictum which says: "If then any one transgresses the prohibition against you, transgress ye likewise against him" [*Surah II:194*]. Do not attack them through resolutions. They did not occupy by means of resolutions. "But fear God, and know that God is with those who restrain themselves" [*ibid.*].

97. The enemy from the very beginning has been wanting certain things that it thinks it can secure through internationally recognized methods—negotiation, I mean. The games that are played here in the United Nations are not our games. They are their games, invented by them, and they do not play them unless they are fully convinced that they will win the games. So do not waste time here. Do not bother the Secretary-General. He is really willing to be helpful, but he cannot. And do not become a member of that certain gang, at least not in issues which must be handled on an Islamic basis. They have only one solution, which is an Islamic solution.

98. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The question of Palestine constitutes one of the oldest issues on the agenda of the General Assembly.

99. The question of Palestine, which came into being as a result of the machinations by world imperialism and its illegitimate brain-child, zionism, centres on the arrogant denial to the Palestinian people of its national inalienable rights. This question lies at the crux of the whole Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East and has occupied the minds of many nations and international organizations in their search for a just solution. Thousands of hours have been spent at hundreds of international and regional conferences and gatherings in considering this issue, and dozens of declarations, decisions, communiqués, resolutions and plans of action have been adopted with the sole purpose of putting an end to the prolonged tragedy of the millions of Palestinians through achieving a lasting and comprehensive solution.

100. None of those efforts, however, has brought closer the attainment of a settlement, or the establishment of peace, for that matter: Palestinian territories, together with other Arab lands, still remain under the firm grip of Israeli occupation; acts of violence and repression against Palestinians and other Arab populations of the occupied territories are affecting even larger segments of those peoples, and there seems to be no end to the Israeli policy of acquisition of territory by force.

101. Continuation of the plight of the Palestinians can in no way be attributed to lack of endeavour on the part of the international community. Nor can it be based on the pretext that there exists no realistic and just basis on which a permanent solution could be built.

102. The United Nations inherited the problem of Palestine when it had already acquired dangerous dimensions. The developments that have occurred since then greatly added to the tension which plunged the region more than once into all-out armed confrontation, resulting in enormous loss of life and property. Conscious of its direct responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, the United Nations remained seized of the situation and exerted every effort in order to bring about a comprehensive and durable peace in the Middle East through a just solution to the Palestinian problem. In the resolutions of its most important authoritative organs, the Security Council and the General Assembly, the United Nations has given a clear definition of the nature and scope of the problem.

103. By its resolution 3376 (XXX), the General Assembly established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, of which the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has the honour of serving as a vice-chairman. At its thirty-first session, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Committee [*see A/39/35, annex I*], which were designed to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights as previously recognized and defined by General Assembly resolutions. Those resolutions not only reflected the verdict of the international community towards the Palestinian issue, but also drew the basic guidelines for achieving an acceptable solution to it.

104. It is highly disquieting for peace-loving humanity to note that none of its repeated demands for the restoration of peace in this war-stricken region of the world, through the implementation of the United Nations resolutions, has been complied with by the Zionist régime of Israel and its imperialist mentors.

105. In gross and repeated breaches of the Charter of the United Nations and in violation of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, Israel stubbornly refuses to withdraw its forces and administration from the Palestinian and other Arab territories it has occupied since 1967. In line with their cynical ambition for establishing the so-called greater Israel, the Zionist rulers of Israel have embarked on the path of absorbing the territories of others. Despite the strong warnings of the international community, the Zionist régime promulgated the "Basic Law", declaring the Holy City of Jerusalem as the "eternal" capital of Israel. In the same vein, Israel not only refuses to return the vast territories of the Syrian Arab Republic in the Golan Heights to Syria's sovereignty, but has enacted legislation purporting permanently to annex them to Israel.

106. Clear reflection of the same illegal practice can be observed in the occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Israel has persistently continued its policy of proliferating Jewish colonial settlements in those areas. As in the past, further thousands of the indigenous inhabitants were forcefully evacuated during the past year from their homes and towns or had to abandon them owing to enormous pressure and intimidation by the occupying authorities and the Zionist settlers. Land and properties thus confiscated are usually put to use for

establishing new settlements and expanding the old ones, or for constructing new military facilities for the occupying forces.

107. Other laws and regulations enforced by the Israeli authorities, in complete violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, have extended their ominous effects to every aspect of life in the occupied territories. Local administrations such as city, town and village councils are dismantled and their elected officials are dismissed and replaced by military or civilian administrations of the occupying Power. Academic and social institutions such as schools, universities and trade unions are repeatedly closed down. Muslim mosques and holy shrines are vandalized, and peaceful civilians remain targets of constant harassment by the terrorist groups of settler vigilantes or police of the occupying Power.

108. These and many similar practices have remained permanent causes of alarm for the population of the occupied territories and for concerned humanity. The bitter memories of the massacre of innocent Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps are still fresh in our minds. If we are to prevent the recurrence of those bestial and abhorrent actions, then we must take serious steps towards defusing the tension which is increasing as a result of the atrocities committed by the Zionist régime.

109. It needs no elaboration that the Zionist arrogance could not have prevailed over the repeatedly expressed wishes of the overwhelming majority of mankind had it not been defended and encouraged by its imperialist allies—first and foremost, United States imperialism. The United States, which has forged a so-called strategic alliance with the Zionist régime, has been rendering it enormous and unconditional political, economic and military support which has enabled it to perpetrate acts of aggression against sovereign Arab countries of the area, notably Syria and Lebanon. It is United States imperialism which has effectively paralysed the Security Council by using its veto power to prevent the adoption of measures that would call to order the outlawed régime of Israel.

110. The perpetual conspiracies of the United States against international peace and security were once again manifested by its negative response to the call of the General Assembly for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East. We strongly condemn that irresponsible attitude towards one of the most burning issues of our time. In this connection, we hail the constructive position of the Soviet Union and voice our support for its timely and realistic proposals of 29 July 1984 [*see A/39/368*].

111. While expressing appreciation to the Secretary-General for his endeavours aimed at preparing the ground for the holding of the proposed conference, we urge him to redouble his efforts in that direction.

112. It is, of course, necessary that the PLO, the sole representative of the people concerned, participate in such a conference on an equal footing. We reject any attempt at isolating the question of Palestine from the rest of the Middle East problem and consider all collusive and partial agreements, including the Camp David deals, to have no moral or legal validity. Past experience has shown that only a just and comprehensive settlement can bring about a lasting peace to the Middle East, the *sine qua non* of which is the attainment by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights.

113. In their struggle to recover their territories and to exercise their national sovereign rights, the heroic people of Palestine and the valiant patriots of Syria and Lebanon have the full solidarity and support of the Afghan people and Government.

114. I wish to conclude my statement with a quotation from the message of Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, commemorated on 29 November 1984. He said:

> "Today, it is a task more urgent than ever before to contribute, through the collective efforts of States, towards achieving peace in the Middle East, peace for all States and peoples in the region.
>
> "While reaffirming the strongest condemnation of the Zionists' savage actions, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan supports the continued efforts of the United Nations towards finding a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem based on the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, truly represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization, including their right to establish an independent national State of their own."

115. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions [*A/39/L.37 and Add. 1, L.38 and Add. 1, L.39 and Add. 1 and L.40 and Add. 1*].

116. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the four draft resolutions. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken. I should like to remind the Assembly that, under rule 88 of its rules of procedure: "The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment."

117. Mr. EU Mun Hoo (Singapore): My delegation believes that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East conflict. We will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolutions before the Assembly, as we regard them as positive contributions to the search for a solution.

118. My delegation is of the view that a just solution of the question of Palestine must, at one and the same time, recognize the rights of the State of Israel. In this regard, we would suggest the exchange of recognition between Israel and the PLO. In order to encourage Israel and the PLO to move in this direction, the international community should urge them to pursue a course of mutual accommodation and compromise. Those who continue to urge Israel not to have any dialogue with the PLO are not helping the process of mutual accommodation. On the other hand, those States which continue to deny the right of Israel to exist are also not helping the cause of peace. My delegation therefore appeals to both Israel and the PLO to recognize each other's rights.

119. My delegation supports the establishment of a Palestine homeland in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and cannot accept the annexation of those territories by Israel. My delegation also fully supports the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which established the fundamental basis for a genuine, stable and lasting peace in the Middle East.

120. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The consideration of the question of Palestine by the General Assembly reveals the lack of specific progress in finding a solution to this problem. In spite of the many peace initiatives, some of which have been echoed in the United Nations, the problem of Palestine and its repercussions on the Middle East situation remain one of the most serious elements of tension confronting the international community today. The Spanish Government regrets that situation.

121. The history of the 37 years that have passed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) makes it clear that only the solution of the problem of Palestine will make it possible to bring about just and lasting peace in the region.

122. Throughout all these years, the Spanish position on the question has been constantly set forth both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. For the Spanish Government, the solution of the Palestine problem should be based on Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967; on the right of all States in the area, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; and on respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination.

123. It is from this standpoint that the Spanish Government understands that Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), although constituting basic decisions in the search for a peaceful negotiated solution to the conflict, do not touch on all the aspects of the problem. For these resolutions to become a real starting-point for an authentic peace process, they must be supplemented by the Security Council through a clear, unequivocal assertion of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

124. For my country, the continuation of the present situation, in which the rights of the Palestinian people continue to be disregarded, is unacceptable. Therefore, we shall vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39. Similarly, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.40, because we believe it to be the duty of the international community to leave no path to peace unexplored, provided that it is liable to lead to a just and comprehensive solution. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to state for the record its opinion that the convening of an international peace conference for the Middle East should not be taken to exclude other peace plans for the region.

125. Mr. COSTA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Palestine is of concern, first of all, to the Palestinian people and the States of the region. However, because of its human aspect and its implications for the security of States—which far transcend the regional context—it is also of interest to the entire international community, for the latter, having recognized the existence, identity and rights of the Palestinian people, must contribute to the search for a political and diplomatic settlement of the Palestinian question.

126. The position of Portugal on this issue stems from a realistic policy based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination on a national territory, and on the need for all States of the region to have secure and internationally recognized frontiers.

127. In this context, Portugal participated in the work of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, at which the representative of Portugal had the opportunity to stress the extent to which this attitude forms the crux of the position of the Portuguese Government regarding this problem. He said, in particular:

> "Such recognition should not remain an abstraction, leaving the Palestinian people frustrated in its legitimate national rights, including its right to govern itself. It should be part of an overall Middle East solution. It should, in particular, be reflected in the right of the Palestinian people to participate, through its representatives, in negotiations to achieve that same settlement. But, at the same time, it would be unthinkable without the recognition of the right of the Palestinians to return to their homeland, if such is their wish. The humanitarian aspect of the problem is so closely linked to its political aspects that it would not seem possible to draw a rigorous distinction between them, nor to conceive of a theory of a just, comprehensive, peaceful and lasting solution to the conflict which ignores them."

128. Portugal, therefore, will continue to support all efforts and all initiatives likely to contribute to a solution to the Palestinian problem, and my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39. It reserves its position regarding draft resolution A/39/L.40 because of the wording of paragraph 3. However, it shall do so in the same spirit which motivated it during the formulation of the consensus achieved at Geneva during the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held there last year, above all with regard to the role given to various bilateral contacts likely to promote the putting forward of proposals and the establishment of conditions aimed at ensuring the success of such an initiative.

129. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): The fact that to date a solution to the question of Palestine has not been found only highlights the complexity and diversity of the dispute. The problem encompasses four principal elements: the human suffering and the existence of refugees in the region; the political inertia stemming from the world community's failure, so far, to reconcile self-determination for the Palestinians with the recognition of the existence of Israel as a sovereign State; the potential that exists that the dispute may explode into another full-fledged war, the consequences of which are difficult to contemplate; and the primary responsibility of all representatives here present for creating an atmosphere of trust conducive to a constructive dialogue among the parties involved, with a view to finding a satisfactory solution to this problem.

130. An analysis of the statements made over a span of years shows that there are three alternatives to the question: first, either continued violence or armed conflict; secondly, armed conflict combined

with diplomatic efforts; or, thirdly, a political solution through negotiations without pre-conditions.

131. My delegation opts for a political solution of the dispute. For this reason, it will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39 and abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.40.

132. In conclusion, my delegation supports the call for negotiations without pre-conditions in order to discuss all points arising from the 1967 war in general and to reconcile self-determination and establishment of a State for the Palestinians with recognition of Israel as a sovereign State within secure borders in particular.

133. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The four draft resolutions before us essentially are based, as they were last year, on the Geneva Declaration on Palestine[1] and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[1] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year.

134. The affirmative vote of Uruguay on these four draft resolutions is consistent with the participation of my country in the Geneva consensus and our constant concern to bring about peaceful solutions.

135. Nevertheless, we believe it to be necessary to confirm the reservations my delegation expressed with regard to both the Geneva Declaration and the Programme of Action.[5]

136. Mr. GROSER (New Zealand): New Zealand has consistently held that a key element in the negotiation of a comprehensive and lasting Middle East peace settlement must be the realization of the rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people. Their most basic right is that of self-determination, including the right to establish their own State, if that is their wish. New Zealand's recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to establish their own nation is balanced by our recognition and support of Israel's own sovereignty and independence. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which New Zealand has always supported, affirms that every State has the right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. Clearly that affirmation applies to Israel.

137. At the same time, resolution 242 (1967) reaffirms the principle that it is unacceptable to acquire territory by force. New Zealand does not recognize the validity of a number of steps Israel has taken since 1967 in defiance of this principle and calls on Israel to withdraw from territories it has occupied since that time.

138. My delegation is not able to support the draft resolutions before us today. A number of the provisions in them do not adequately reflect the balance of principles in resolution 242 (1967) or contribute realistically towards the search for a settlement of the Palestinian problem. With regard to draft resolution A/39/L.40, New Zealand's reservations concern the practicality of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East at this time. In principle, New Zealand supports the idea of such a conference, but until all parties concerned are prepared to participate with realistic expectations of contributing to a settlement, New Zealand remains cautious about committing United Nations resources in this way.

139. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.40 only because it is against the Zionist base. We just cannot refrain from voting positively for a draft resolution which our Palestinian brothers consider in their favour and the Zionist enemy considers against it.

140. So far as the Palestinians' right to a State is concerned, our position is very well known. We believe that Palestine belongs to the Palestinians and the flag of Palestine alone will soon, by the grace of God, be hoisted over the entirety of Palestine.

141. We look forward to seeing the State of Palestine, including all the occupied territories, restored to the Palestinians, and we look forward to seeing the Zionist usurpers return permanently to where they came from.

142. Regarding the draft resolutions which refer to the withdrawal of the Zionist forces from the occupied territories, there again we believe that the Zionist forces must withdraw from the whole of Palestine, and from our point of view the phrase "occupied since 1967" is irrelevant. We therefore declare our reservation regarding that phrase wherever it appears. We believe that the occupied territories must be returned to the Palestinians whether they were occupied before or after 1967.

143. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): Draft resolution A/39/L.38 provides for the continuation of the activities of the "Division for Palestinian Rights". This unit, a mouthpiece for Arab extremists and their backers, has compromised the integrity of the United Nations Secretariat. The discriminatory nature of this "Division" is illustrated by the fact that, whereas terrible tragedies on the globe, like that of Kampuchea, have not been fully discussed at the United Nations, the "Division for Palestinian Rights" drains the United Nations purse in providing a sinecure for the staff of a propaganda organ of a terrorist organization.

144. Draft resolution A/39/L.39 is yet another wasteful drain on United Nations funds. If adopted, this draft resolution will continue the effect of providing a sounding-board for interests and forces extraneous to the United Nations system. The sponsors of this draft resolution would monopolize the time and funds of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat to the detriment of the Department's other legitimate responsibilities.

145. Draft resolution A/39/L.40 is not the General Assembly's first attempt to undermine Security Council resolution 242 (1967) by setting guidelines which would undermine and sabotage the carefully balanced intent of resolution 242 (1967)—which is not even mentioned in this draft resolution. The sponsors seek to eradicate the only viable resolution for a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Some countries represented here would have us sanction a diktat regarding the vital interests of sovereign States. The expression of regret in this draft resolution at not attending a conference is utterly superfluous and reveals the true colours of the draft resolution: those negating conciliation. Everyone here knows the extremist thrust of the proposed international conference, and it is perfectly legitimate for Israel to keep away from it.

146. Rather than introduce barren formulas and hostile rhetoric, the sponsors of the draft resolution would be well advised to try to turn the United Nations into an instrument of conciliation and understanding. Instead, its machinery is being used through these draft resolutions, which the Iranian

representative calls "silly" resolutions, to deepen dissension and promote conflicts. Israel will register its condemnation of this negativist attitude by voting against the draft resolution.

147. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take decisions on the various draft resolutions before it. We turn first to draft resolution A/39/L.37 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions (resolution 39/49 A).[6]

148. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/39/L.38 and Add. 1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions (resolution 39/49 B).[6]

149. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/39/L.39 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions (resolution 39/49 C).[6]

150. The PRESIDENT: I understand that a question has been raised concerning the programme budget implications of certain activities called for in draft resolution A/39/L.39, which has just been adopted. The Controller has assured me that the resources are available within the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat for the implementation of these activities.

151. Next the Assembly will turn to draft resolution A/39/L.40 and Add.1. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 2. If I hear no objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote first. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 120 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

152. The PRESIDENT: A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/39/L.40 and Add.1. If I hear no objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 96 votes to 18, with 29 abstentions.

153. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/39/L.40 and Add.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 121 votes to 3, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/49 D).[6]

154. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

155. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): This year, as in the past, the Albanian delegation has made clear the position of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania on the question of Palestine, expressing the full support of the Albanian people and its Government for the just cause of the Palestinian people. It was in conformity with that attitude that we voted in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39. Nevertheless, we have our reservations, which we have explained in the past.

156. Our delegation did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/39/L.40, which deals with the well-known Soviet proposal on the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East. Several times in the past, we have made known our position in relation to such a conference. Our position was stressed again by the Albanian delegation in its statement before the General Assembly on 27 November 1984 [*75th meeting*], during the discussion of the situation in the Middle East. The aim of the Soviet socialist imperialists is to consolidate the positions of the Soviet Union in the Middle East in rivalry with the American imperialists and to secure a greater involvement in the whole course of events there.

157. Mr. LEHNE (Austria): The Austrian delegation supported draft resolution A/39/L.40, which has just been adopted by the General Assembly. It did so in view of our consistent support in principle for the proposal to convene an international conference on peace in the Middle East. We still believe that such a conference, held in the right conditions and with good preparation, could contribute to progress towards a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

158. It is obvious to us, however, that the successful convening of the international peace conference presupposes the agreement of all parties concerned to participate in it. We fully share the assessment of the Secretary-General that the conditions required for convening the proposed conference with any chance of success are not met at the present time.

159. Mr. McGRADY (Ireland): I speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community in explanation of their vote on the draft resolutions.

160. The views of the Ten on the principles necessary to secure peace in the Middle East are well known and were set out in the Ten's address to the Assembly on this item. [*89th meeting*].

161. The Ten are ready to support any constructive effort aimed at negotiating a just, lasting and peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

162. As previously stated, the Ten have no objections of principle to the holding of international conferences. At the right time, the holding of an international conference could make a major contribution towards achieving a negotiated settlement. The Ten believe, however, that much groundwork must first be done between the principal parties to overcome their fundamental differences in order to secure the elements necessary for a successful outcome.

163. As stated at the meeting of the European Council, held at Dublin on 3 and 4 December 1984, the Ten regard it as vitally important that renewed efforts should be made towards negotiations for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

164. The Ten do not believe that wording such as occurs in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/39/L.40, which singles out for criticism two of the proposed participants in a conference, is either helpful or productive in this context.

165. The Ten trust, in regard to draft resolution A/39/L.39, that the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat will continue to be guided in its activities by the principle of impartiality and maintain its normal decision-making process. Finally, they believe that, given the difficult international financial situation, every effort should be made to avoid placing unnecessary burdens on the United Nations budget.

166. Mr. LUNA MENDOZA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru voted in favour of all four draft resolutions.

167. As regards the Geneva Declaration on Palestine[1] and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[1] adopted by acclamation at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, my delegation wishes to recall that on that occasion, the Government of Peru stated the following:

> "Through this statement, the Peruvian delegation wishes to reiterate its support for all efforts directed towards enabling the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and to independent statehood. The Peruvian delegation also supports the right of all the States of the region to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and of other decisions taken by the international community.
>
> "However, the approach and drafting of several of the paragraphs in the Declaration and Programme of Action prevent the Peruvian delegation from supporting the document as a whole. This is true, in particular, of paragraphs (5) and (18) of part I of the Programme of Action."[5]

168. Mr. FERM (Sweden): It is Sweden's position that the most appropriate forum for serious negotiations towards a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict is to be found within the framework of the United Nations. As my Government sees it, agreement on holding a peace conference under United Nations auspices along the lines recommended by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, would be a promising sign that real progress was within reach.

169. My Government therefore regrets that it has not been possible so far to arrive at the consensus among the proposed participants which is a necessary prerequisite for the convening of a peace conference. It cannot be the intention of draft resolution A/39/L.40 to attempt somehow to force Governments to come to a conference or to convene one

without their agreement to participate. The support of my delegation for that draft resolution in no way implies that we would question the sovereign right of the Governments concerned to decide for themselves on their participation.

170. Our vote expresses our continued support for the concept of a peace conference on the Middle East.

171. Mr. FARMER (Australia): A fundamental principle guiding Australia's policy on the Middle East is the recognition of the urgent need to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East dispute. Australia supports a peaceful, negotiated solution to the conflict in the Middle East region. Consistent with this support, Australia believes that the concept of an international peace conference, agreed to by the parties—and I repeat "agreed to by the parties"—should not be excluded as a means of achieving this objective.

172. However, it is, in our view, essential that the framework of such a conference should not seek to prescribe the outcome of negotiations among the parties on the elements of a Middle East settlement. General Assembly resolution 38/58 C sought to make such a prescription. For this reason, Australia cannot support a proposal for a conference "in conformity with the provisions of resolution 38/58 C" or the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[1] adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, which the General Assembly endorsed in resolution 38/58 C. Australia voted against resolution 38/58 C and has, accordingly, voted against paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/39/L.40 on this occasion because of its reference to resolution 38/58 C.

173. Our negative vote on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/39/L.40 also reflected Australia's continuing opposition to the reference in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C to the status of the PLO. The Australian Government will maintain its refusal to recognize the PLO while the PLO maintains its denial of Israel's right to exist. The Australian Government acknowledges that the PLO, which represents the opinion of a significant portion of the Palestinian people, should be included in the process of seeking a comprehensive settlement. It believes, however, that the PLO's opportunity to engage productively in such a process is limited and perhaps non-existent while it persists in denying Israel's right to exist.

174. The statement to be made later in explanation of vote by Australia on the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 36, on the situation in the Middle East, applies equally under this item in its references to Australia's fundamental commitment to Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized boundaries, the central importance to a settlement of the Palestinian issue, and the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people.

175. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The position of the Government of Finland on the question of Palestine is well known and remains unchanged. There can be no lasting peace in the Middle East without a just solution of the problem of Palestine through the attainment and exercise by the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights, including the right of national self-determination. Therefore, Israel must withdraw from the Arab territories occupied since 1967. The Palestinians must be given their right to participate in all negotiations on their own future.

176. Conversely, the Government of Finland continues to conceive of the realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians as part of, and within the framework of, a comprehensive settlement of the question of the Middle East through negotiation on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Accordingly, all States in the region, including Israel, have the right to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force.

177. The draft resolutions just adopted, unfortunately, fail to represent the balance which my Government finds a prerequisite for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement. My delegation therefore abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/39/L.37 and L.38 and, while voting in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.39 and L.40, did so with reservations.

178. With particular reference to draft resolution A/39/L.40, it will be recalled that Finland participated in the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, and joined in the consensus on the final documents of that Conference. However, we did so with reservations, and in this connection I should like only to refer to those reservations.[5]

179. Mr. TELLMANN (Norway): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.37. However, my Government has reservations concerning paragraph 2 of that draft resolution and would have voted against that paragraph if there had been a separate vote on it.

180. We also abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.40. We have, however, serious reservations about paragraph 3 of that draft resolution, in which two Member States have been singled out in a way that we do not find acceptable. My delegation therefore voted against that paragraph.

181. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation supported and voted in favour of the four draft resolutions. Indeed, only a few Member States opposed them, and they are well known to us all. However, my country wishes to reaffirm here its consistent position on the question of Palestine. One of the basic elements of that position is that we have reservations concerning any reference in draft resolutions that could be interpreted in any way as expressing my country's readiness to recognize the Zionist entity or to ascribe any legality to it.

182. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States voted against the draft resolutions because we found them to be unbalanced, unfair and unpromising. They will not achieve their stated goal.

183. The United States has great sympathy for the people of Palestine, sympathy which we express through large and continuing humanitarian support and social-service support of many kinds through many years. We see these human victims of political warfare as we see refugees everywhere: as tragic residues of the violent politics of our times.

184. The United States regards these draft resolutions as an unwarranted and outrageous interference in the internal affairs of the United States. The Charter of the United Nations does not give the General Assembly jurisdiction over the foreign poli-

cies of Member States, except in those rare instances where those foreign policies are a clear threat to peace and international security, determined by the Security Council to be so.

185. In considering the call for a Middle East conference in draft resolution A/39/L.40, the United States believes it is also necessary to take into account draft resolution A/39/L.20, which has been submitted to the Assembly under agenda item 36, on the situation in the Middle East. These two items must be linked in our consideration because they are linked inevitably in their subject-matter.

186. Draft resolution A/39/L.20 charges Israel with not being a peace-loving State. Yet that charge will be linked by our actions this afternoon to the call for an international conference on the Palestine question. Obviously, it is at best inconsistent to apply sanctions against a country and, at the same time, invite it to a conference. It is the justice of Alice in Wonderland: judge first, investigate later. Such an attitude could not possibly lead to good-faith negotiations. Good-faith negotiations include the subjective concept of honest intent and purpose, and also include the objective test of how the matter would appear to a reasonable person in the same circumstances. This draft resolution, by its very nature, violates both these concepts: of subjective honest intent and of objective fairness. It neither evidences intent and purpose aimed at negotiated solutions nor is likely by any subjective test to induce all concerned parties to join in a negotiated solution.

187. Yet the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, of 23 May 1969,[7] imposes on us all an obligation to negotiate in good faith. This means that each side is to propose and counter-propose, to listen to the other side and to speak with the intent of actually arriving at an agreement with which the two sides can live. The process is very important. There is to be give-and-take, constantly narrowing the original differences until an agreement is finally reached. Good faith requires that such a process be gone through.

188. Unfortunately, the draft resolution before us subverts the very idea of process. It precludes a negotiating process. It declares at the outset what the aim of the negotiations is: it is to confirm what the General Assembly declares to be the truth, the totally untenable and unfair assertion that the State of Israel—of all States in this body—is a non-peace-loving State.

189. There are many reasons why the idea of an international conference is fatally flawed. One wonders how many nations in this body would support an international conference to resolve the border disputes in which they find themselves. Would Peru and Ecuador submit their border dispute to an international conference of the sort called for here? Would Venezuela and Guyana submit their border dispute to such determination? Indeed, would the United Kingdom and Argentina submit their border dispute to this outcome?

190. We all know that the conference called for here, the outcome of which is already provided, would be an exercise in ideology and in war by other means against the State of Israel, a propaganda exercise. By calling for a conference under these prejudicial conditions, the fairness of this body is put in question.

191. The United Nations, we believe, should not put its fairness in question. We believe that the United States has the right to have its sovereignty respected, that the State of Israel has the right to expect fair play from this body and, indeed, that the peoples of the world have the right to expect that our efforts towards peace and the resolution of conflicts will be good-faith efforts towards peace and the resolution of conflicts.

192. I find that one of the draft resolutions, A/39/L.39, provides as good evidence as any of the caricature of fairness present in these draft resolutions. I refer to subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph 2, which calls upon the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, in full co-operation and co-ordination with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to: "Publish newsletters and articles in its respective publications on Israeli violations of the human rights of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories".

193. I ask: where is the dispassion in that requirement? Where is the concern for the human rights of all the inhabitants of that region? Where is the judicious spirit which all members and all peoples have the right to expect from the General Assembly?

194. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization wishes to make a statement. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX).

195. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): As we approach the celebration of the birth of the Prince of Peace, we the people who come from the land of peace shall also today celebrate the affirmation and reaffirmation of the determination of the international community to attain peace through a peaceful solution and a peaceful process.

196. During the voting we saw three red lights, but may I assure the General Assembly that those three red lights will in no way deter us from our perseverance in our endeavours to attain the long-overdue peace for the peoples of Palestine, the Middle East and the rest of the world.

197. Crocodile tears were shed this afternoon by the representative of the United States over the Palestinian victims of force, when it is the United States that refuses to admit that it is the political and diplomatic mainstay and main support of Israeli policies and practices. It is the Government of the United States that supplies bullets and the many millions of dollars in investments for the malicious and aggressive expansionism and *lebensraum* of the Zionist entity. It is the United States that helps perpetuate the current state of affairs. It is the United States that obstructs the call for a peace conference.

198. Only three weeks ago, the Palestine National Council asserted that the appropriate framework to achieve a solution was an international peace conference under the aegis of the United Nations, in consultation with the Security Council and, of course, with the participation of the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Naturally, the principal party here is the Palestinian people, which is represented by the PLO. A United Nations-sponsored peace conference is the proper forum, for it is the United Nations that helped create the question of Palestine. I do not see any parallelism between the question of Palestine and the situation between neighbouring States throughout the world. It is not the United Nations that created the dispute between Peru and

Ecuador. But on the question of Palestine, it was the intervention of the United States and its pressure demanding the imposition of the partition of my country, the fragmentation of my people and the displacement of millions of Palestinians.

199. This morning, the Assembly heard some untruths about history. It was Count Folke Bernadotte, the first United Nations envoy of peace, who described the origins of the Palestine refugee problem; and it was Count Folke Bernadotte who was assassinated by none other than the current Foreign Minister of Israel and the party which has a representative sitting here, that same party that collaborated with the Nazis during the Second World War and called for co-operation with Hitler against the English. Yes, it was Count Folke Bernadotte who in his first report referred to the genesis of the Palestine refugee problem.

200. In his statement this morning [*94th meeting*], the representative of Tel Aviv said that the cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict was not rooted in the territories Israel has occupied since 1967, nor was the refugee problem a result of those attacks, and so on. I quite agree. The roots are in the plans, the ideology and the *lebensraum* policy of the Zionists who found a base in my homeland, in Palestine.

201. They call for negotiations. How much more can we add to the decision of our National Council that a peace conference be held in which the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict would sit together and discuss peace? How much more civilized can we be? But, of course, if what is demanded is *Pax Americana* and *Pax Israeli,* then those red lights we saw during the voting will remain and continue to be the obstacle to peace.

202. The PRESIDENT: Some representatives have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

203. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This morning we heard a new attempt to rewrite history. That attempt will suffer the same fate as previous such attempts made in this Hall and in committees at every session of the General Assembly. The representative of the Zionist entity has tried to twist historic truth by describing the Arabs as the aggressors and the Israelis as the victims who had to repulse aggression and threats, and by saying that the territories were occupied during legitimate military defence operations.

204. We should like first of all to speak of what happened in 1948. The representative of the Zionist entity in this Hall in previous years, and its representative this year in the Fifth Committee, described the Zionist movement as the greatest liberation movement in the world. They speak of large-scale military operations undertaken by Zionist armies and Haganah gangs against the British Mandate and against Palestinian citizens to put an end to the Mandate and to empty Palestine of its indigenous inhabitants, whose fathers and forefathers had lived there for centuries. These military operations extended to other Arab States close to Palestine. This led to the well-known military confrontation which the Zionist entity has used to consolidate its occupation of Palestine.

205. The aggressor in 1948 was the Zionist party that applied the slogan of the founder of world zionism: "Palestine is a country without people and the Jews are a people without a country." In fact, the Zionist armies emptied Palestine of its indigenous inhabitants. They drove out 900,000 Palestinians and replaced them by Jewish emigrants from Europe. Thus, in 1948 the aggressor was the Zionist party.

206. In 1956, it was the Zionist entity, with the participation of two other States, that launched an attack on Egypt in protest against the nationalization of the Suez Canal. Its troops reached the banks of the Suez Canal. Did the nationalization of the Suez Canal in fact represent aggression against the Zionist entity? President Eisenhower was not convinced by that Zionist argument and firmly opposed the aggression, demanding the withdrawal of the Zionist invasion troops.

207. On 5 June 1967, the Zionist entity carried out a surprise attack on Egyptian airports and launched intensive air raids against Egypt in protest against Egyptian operations at Sharm El-Sheikh. Did those security operations give the Zionist entity any right to attack? The French President, Charles de Gaulle, was not convinced by that argument and took a firm attitude against that aggression. That attitude was a turning-point in French policy with regard to the Middle East and Palestine.

208. In 1973, the Arabs, for the first time, had to have recourse to legitimate defence to free their territories and put an end to six years of aggression by repelling the occupier.

209. In all these confrontations and wars, it was the Zionist entity which, militarily, politically and morally, was the aggressor. The attempts to distort history that we heard this morning can serve no purpose. The Palestinians did not flee at the instigation of the Arabs but from fear of the massacres—like the well-known massacres of Deir Yassin and Qibya—perpetrated by the Israelis against the Palestinians. No one was safe, not even the United Nations Mediator, who was assassinated by the Israelis. Not a single Palestinian has fled of his own accord. The Palestinians never leave their country voluntarily. They leave under the threat of Meir Kahane, who compels them to leave alive or to leave dead.

210. These refugees must return to their homeland, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 194 (III).

211. This morning we heard statements which cast doubt on the legitimacy even of Palestinian rights and United Nations principles and denied the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and to establish their own State on their national territory.

212. Mr. LUNA MENDOZA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am obliged to speak at this stage of the debate for the following reasons. The representative of the United States, in her explanation of vote, mentioned the relations between Peru and Ecuador as an example of situations which I would describe as inaccurate and unusual. As is known, Peru has no dispute with any of its neighbouring States. The boundary dispute which lasted for many years between Peru and Ecuador was ended by an international instrument signed more than 40 years ago, which was not only binding on the parties but guaranteed by four friendly countries, including the United States.

213. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With regard to the statement by the representative of Peru, the delegation of Ecuador would like to reiterate what the Minister for Foreign Relations of Ecuador, Mr. Terán Terán, stated on 28

September 1984, when he reaffirmed Ecuador's rights as an Amazonian country

> "from the epic discovery of the Amazon River by the Quito expedition of 1541 to the time when Ecuador, faithful to its tradition of peace and legality, sought to strengthen friendly relations with Peru and sought a sincere climate of mutual understanding in order to promote a just and honourable solution to its territorial controversy" [*13th meeting, para. 59*].

214. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the League of Arab States has requested to make a statement in reply. I call on him, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V).

215. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): We listened this morning [*94th meeting*] to the Israeli representative turning the cannons of distortion on the reality and the background of the Palestinian question. I do not think that there is any need to repudiate many of his utterances, except to state that in much of what he said there was an assumption that the Member States of this body are not only gullible but amenable to persuasion by his distortions.

216. At the outset of his speech, he equated the question of the Palestinian people and Palestinian legitimate rights to slogans. To reduce issues which have assumed sanctity for a whole nation and have the respect and recognition of the international community to mere slogans is to insult the intelligence of the international community. But it has become habitual to insult the intelligence of the international community. Furthermore, he reduced the terms "Israeli expansion" and "Israeli aggression" to an ideology of myth, as he described it. This is not the time to say where Israel was born under the partition plan and where it is now; or to mention that Israel has withdrawn from the Sinai as a matter of "concession" when the large potential oil resources available indicate that that kind of withdrawal was effected with a historical grudge.

217. Such distortions have become habitual in this body. This attempt to make the issue an issue of the transfer of refugees—Arab Jewish refugees and Palestinian refugees—has two basic defects. One is that there are people of Jewish persuasion in many Arab countries, and we know what happened in Baghdad when a trickle of people, individual Jews, were incited to go to Israel. There was a Zionist plan that there should be many more. We heard at that time how synagogues and Jewish-owned shops were being bombed, only to discover at a later stage that these were the actions of the intelligence operatives of the Zionist organization and of the Israeli State. By the same token, we know what happened in 1952 with the Lavon affair, when Israeli intelligence agents bombed the library of the United States in order to cement the disruption of Egyptian-American relations. It was discovered at a later stage that those Israeli agents were received in Israel as heroes when an exchange of prisoners took place.

218. I do not want to repudiate or try to argue against these various distortions. What is more important is what the Australian representative said—that an international conference should be agreed to by the parties. Of course it should, but can the representative of Australia tell us how long this international body can wait? Is there a time-frame that might be acceptable? Then he said that the terms of reference of that international conference should not prescribe "the outcome". What would we negotiate on? We would negotiate on the feasibility of a mutually acceptable outcome. We would not negotiate for negotiation's sake. In the view of the Australian delegation, is there in the terms of reference a denial of Israel's right to exist within secure boundaries? At this moment, the question for the Australian representative—and supposedly also for the representative of the United States—to answer is this: what boundaries do they recognize and what boundaries of Israel do they want us to recognize? When we say "prescribe the outcome", the outcome has to be predetermined, not in its details but at least in its principles and in its modalities.

219. The United States representative said that the United States has shown sympathy with the people of Palestine and she referred to humanitarian and social services. Let me say very openly and frankly that we appreciate the humanitarian concern and the social services of many educational and other foundations, governmental and non-governmental. We take cognizance of United States Secretary of State George Shultz's statement that the United States is interested in the improvement of the quality of life of the Palestinians. However, the question is not one of philanthropy; it is not one of charity for the Palestinians; it is not one of humanitarian concern, although that has a dimension of nobility. What is important is that these are victims. The representative of the United States has stated that they are human victims, and we agree, but human victims of what? They are victims of the displacement of Palestinians, the disfranchisement of Palestinians, discriminatory practices against Palestinians, carried out deliberately by the Israeli State in the occupied territories and inside Israel itself. I do not need to give details of the separateness and alienation which Israeli citizens of Arab origin experience. Israel has created a "Jewish State" which by definition is exclusionary, which institutionalizes discrimination against non-Jews and therefore against the Palestinians who happen to be non-Jews in these circumstances; they are systematically discriminated against, they are disfranchised.

220. Therefore, when the representative of the United States objects to the convening of an international conference and objects to the fact that we have stated that Israel is not a peace-loving State, let her remember the Camp David agreement, which was an American-brokered agreement. After the agreement was signed, Israel established more settlements in the occupied territories, attacked Baghdad and invaded Lebanon, in addition to the daily raids against the people of Lebanon and against Palestinian refugees.

221. Good-faith negotiations, yes; honest intent, yes; but in view of what the representatives of Peru and Ecuador found to their amazement, and to our amazement, let me ask this. Is what is involved a border dispute, or is it the destiny of a people?

222. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I spoke this morning [*ibid.*] of the importance of history, and indeed what I have heard from representatives of some States here has confirmed this importance, because to justify their implacable hostility to my country the Arab leaders offer arguments purportedly based on history.

223. The basic Arab claim—we have heard it today many times—is that the Jews seized Palestine from a Palestinian people which had lived there for ages and are its rightful owners. At the twenty-ninth session of

the General Assembly, for example, Arafat stated: "Its Arab people"—the Arab people of Palestine—"were engaged in farming and building, spreading culture throughout the land for thousands of years, . . . " [*2282nd meeting, para. 40*]. The Jews came "to usurp our land". This string of assertions has been repeated so tirelessly that for some it has acquired the cachet of self-evident truth, but it is not supported by history. "For thousands of years," the country was in fact inhabited by Jews. The antiquity of the Jewish nation and its ancient struggle for independence are of course universally known through the Bible. Not so well known is the Jews' struggle for their land in the thousands of years that followed the biblical period. Despite the dispersion of large numbers of Jews, Jews continued to live throughout the centuries in the land, through the Roman conquest, the Byzantine conquest, the Arab conquest—and, by the way, the Arabs sought the support of the Jews for their conquest—the Mamelukes, the Turks. I could go on—the British.

224. After Jewish independence was ended in the country, no other people laid claim to it; no other people reclaimed it as uniquely their own and rebuilt it. The country was laid waste, it was devastated, it was in ruins, and when great numbers of Jews returned in the nineteenth century to this country they found a desert.

225. Arafat, and many of the speakers here, I am sure, describe Palestine before the return of the Jews as a "verdant area teeming with people", but Western travellers, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, without exception told a different story.

226. In 1738, Thomas Shaw, an Englishman, wrote of "the absence of people to till Palestine's fertile soil". Was Thomas Shaw a Zionist propagandist?

227. In 1785, Constantine François Volney, a Frenchman, described the "ruined" and "desolate" country. Was François Volney a propagandist for the Zionists?

228. In 1824, Alexander Keith, recalling Volney's description, wrote this: "In his day the land had not fully reached its last degree of desolation and depopulation." Was Alexander Keith a Zionist propagandist? Well, maybe not him, but how about Alphonse de Lamartine, who in 1835 said this:

> "Outside the gates of Jerusalem we saw indeed no living object, heard no living sound, we found the same void, the same silence . . . as we should have expected before the entombed gates of Pompeii or Herculaneum . . . a complete eternal silence reigns in the town, on the highways, in the country . . . the tomb of a whole people."

Was Lamartine a Zionist propagandist, too?

229. How about that most famous traveller to the Holy Land, Mark Twain? He visited Palestine in 1867 and described the trip that he took to the Galilee. This is what he said: "We never saw a human being on the whole route." Was Twain also a Zionist propagandist? Of course he was not.

230. None of these great men was. They were objective reporters of the scene that they saw with their own eyes. And in fact in a report in the work of the great cartographer, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, in 1881, he observed this: "In Judea"—members will notice that he did not refer to it as the West Bank; that term was not invented until Jordan seized control of that territory—"In Judea, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that for miles and miles there is no appearance of present life or habitation." Was Arthur Penrhyn Stanley a Zionist propagandist?

231. Let me close with one more quotation from Mark Twain, who said: "Palestine was a desolate country, a silent mournful expanse . . . Even the olive and the cactus, those friends of a worthless soil, had almost deserted the country."

232. Now, somebody here is lying. Somebody here is not telling the truth. It is either Mark Twain or Arafat. And I suggest that we put this to the test of all the hundreds and hundreds of travellers, the cartographers, the reporters, the people who travelled to this land before there was an Assembly such as this where lies and distortions could be put forward without any challenge. But there is history, there is history. How did this "worthless soil", to use Mark Twain's expression, come about? How is it that in 1880 there were fewer than 100,000 people in this country? How did it come to life, and how do we have now all these millions of people? They did not procreate; that is impossible biologically.

233. It was through the efforts of the returning Jews that this worthless soil came back to life. Arabs from the surrounding lands migrated to it in droves to partake of the growing economy established by the Jews. Between 1893 and 1947, the Arab population in the areas inhabited by Jews increased an astonishing fivefold. As Winston Churchill noted in 1939: "Far from being persecuted, the Arabs have crowded into the country and multiplied."

234. I did not say that Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan. Yasser Arafat did. King Hussein did. The Arabs of Palestine already possess a State of their own, Jordan. It comprises 77 per cent of Mandated Palestine's area, while the Jewish State, Israel, covers the remaining 23 per cent.

235. Those who uncritically accept Palestinian nationhood and its right to a separate State must surely ask themselves this: are there two Palestinian Arab nations, or does that single nation require two States? History gives us that answer.

236. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I had not intended to exercise the right of reply, since the hour is late, but I feel impelled to do so, especially after listening to the representative of Israel.

237. When history comes to be assessed in relation to territory, one should not forget about law. I am quite convinced, as a modest lawyer, that international lawyers tonight would be tremendously amused to hear that, as the representative of Israel has just stated quite clearly, when the Jewish people claimed their independence, namely, in 1947, as he put it, the territory of Palestine was what we call in international law *res nullius.*

238. I think this is the height of folly, the height of sophistry, the height of ridiculous imagination. As we all know, the theory of *res nullius* in relation to territory had long been abandoned at the end of the nineteenth century.

239. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): If we accepted the quibbles heard in this Hall, we would give the Phoenicians, the Greeks and the Romans the right to return to this territory where traces of their ancestors are found. Those who have expelled the Palestinians from their homes and farms and have seized their belongings emigrated from Europe and Asia. I need mention only a few of those refugees who have played a major

role in the movement to empty the occupied Palestinian territories of their indigenous inhabitants.

240. For example, David Ben-Gurion, the founder of Mapei and leader of Rafi, who was Prime Minister 10 times, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 20. Menachem Begin, the founder of Herut, who was twice Prime Minister and who called the Palestinians "animals on two feet", emigrated to Palestine at the age of 29. Shimon Peres, who heads the occupation Ministry, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 11. Levy Eshkol, who was four times Foreign Minister, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 19. Golda Meir, in reply to a question, said there was no people called the Palestinian people. She was twice Prime Minister, and she emigrated to Palestine at the age of 23. Moshe Sharett, who was twice Prime Minister, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 12.

241. Abba Eban, who at one time held the post of Foreign Minister in the occupation Government and who is now Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Knesset, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 25. Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, who was three times President of the occupation State, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 22. Zalman Shazar, who was twice President of the occupation State, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 35. Mordecai Ben-Borat, who was Minister of State in the Government of Menachem Begin and author of the well-known phrase, "Justice does not demand that a refugee return to his homeland", and who is now President of the "Borat" Committee in charge of organizing settlements in occupied Palestine, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 12.

242. It should also be noted that Mordecai Ben-Borat was born in an Arab country in which a presidential decree was promulgated that authorizes all Jewish citizens to return to the country if they so desire. However, so far he has not returned and is now planning to empty our country of its original inhabitants by the application of the maxim "Justice does not demand that a refugee return to his homeland" and on the basis of the principle that any Jew has the right to establish himself in any part of the territory of biblical Israel.

243. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should just like to mention three points in exercising my right of reply. One is that, when my delegation refers to the occupied land, we usually refer to it by its original name and say "occupied Palestine", or we refer to it by its real present name, which is the "Zionist base". If I refer in my speeches to its artificial label, "Israel", it is simply because I am quoting someone. That is the first point.

244. The second point is that the representative of the Zionist base has been trying to justify recolonization. Many colonies and colonialists know very well that colonization has often been wrongly justified simply by appeal to the illogical reasoning that it produces development and economic prosperity and brings material happiness to the area.

245. We come from the third world. In many of our countries there are areas of devastation and deserts. We have never wished the Zionists to come and repair and build on them for us. We love our home countries as they are and we hate to see Zionist hegemony and intervention in our countries. I am sure that the Palestinians have the same feeling. Therefore, no justification can be found in the load of nonsense we heard from the Zionist representative.

246. Thirdly, regarding the residence of the Zionist elements in Palestine, my delegation has no objection to the Jews who have been residing in Palestine for centuries, or to the Ashkenazi Jews who may wish to stay there when the flag of Palestine is hoisted over the entire land of Palestine. This would be the only policy left to the Palestinian Government. We object only to the Palestinian State being occupied and then run under an artificial label, which was given to it, regrettably, by the United Nations. The State of Israel, they call it, and it is a Zionist racist State. We object to that, but if some of the Ashkenazi Jews even wished to stay in Palestine after its liberation, we would have no objection to that.

247. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I did not say that there was no Arab claim to Palestine in 1948; I said that there was no such claim throughout the centuries—to use the words that I heard here, "from time immemorial"—on the part of the Palestinian people. The fact that the representative of Iraq chose to deflect his answer to 1948, I suggest is revealing.

248. I did not say either that Jews did not continue migrating into Palestine after the twentieth century; I said it began in the nineteenth century. But I cited the fact that the country was indeed desolate, as the various travellers whom I cited confirmed. What I said was that we did not develop in other peoples' land. We came back to our own land, where we had a continual presence, albeit not very flourishing, because there were not very many people there in the first place. But it is our development, it is my great grandfather's farm that he built in 1896 and the many farms that were built elsewhere, that produced a tremendous surge of Arab immigration into the country. We welcomed those Arabs. As far as we are concerned, they have a place in our land, contrary to their position.

249. I must confess that I heard a very unpleasant note today, because the Arab refusal to view the problem for what it is—not, by the way, as a refugee problem, I did not suggest that either—a border dispute, and their insistence on demanding a second Palestinian Arab State makes one wonder if they are willing to give more than lip-service to Israel's right to exist, or if their tactics are merely a different strategy in their campaign to destroy Israel. This refers, of course, to those Arab countries that have still refused to recognize Israel.

250. Nothing serves to increase this suspicion more than the insistence of Arab leaders on designating the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian Arabs. Does the PLO represent the Palestinian Arabs? Until recently, it was—how shall I put this—inadvisable for any Arab to question, let alone challenge, these claims or the PLO policy. In fact, it was mortally dangerous. But there are many who have, and among them are Abd-al Nur Janho, member of the Ramallah Municipal Council, who came out publicly against the PLO; Hashem Khozandar, the Imam of Gaza, who supported Camp David and was known for his moderate view; Muhammed Hamed Abu Warda, the deputy head of the Jebalia Council, who came out in favour of the Egyptian-Israeli peace; Youssef Al Khatib, Chairman of the Ramallah District Village League, who advocated coexistence with Israel; and a name that I am sure all delegations here will be familiar with, Issam Sartawi,

who recommended a peaceful settlement with the Jewish State.

251. None of these people is alive today. Janho was assassinated in 1978, Khozander in 1979, Abu Warda in 1980, Al Khatib, along with his 23-year-old son, in 1981, and Sartawi in 1983. There have been more murders since. All these murders were carried out by the PLO, the group which "democratically" claims to speak on their behalf. In fact, from June 1967 to January 1982 alone, the PLO murdered 346 Palestinian Arabs, often including their women and children, who dared to speak out against the PLO.

252. Now we have a new development. There are at least two mortal enemies claiming the dubious mantle as sole representative of the Palestinian Arabs. They continue to use the traditional method of disposing of each other, and of any others who would try to represent Palestinian Arabs, with bullets.

253. Now there are many Palestinian Arabs who, free from the threat of assassination, would speak out for Arab-Jewish coexistence. The tragedy of the Palestinian Arabs is that since the 1920s, from the Grand Mufti, Haj Aminel Husseim, through Ahmed Shukairy, through Yasser Arafat, they have been under the tyranny of a small, violent band that is bent not on coexistence with the Jews but on their annihilation, and any Arab with a dissenting voice is gunned down.

254. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the observer of the League of Arab States.

255. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): I am disturbed by two things. First, I am immensely disturbed by the convergence of the American position with the Israeli position on treating the question of Palestine within the framework of a border dispute.

256. I do not mind the Israeli record, which is replete with distortions, but I do mind such a judgement on the part of a country, a super-Power, with global responsibilities for international peace and security. I do venture to hope that that convergence is accidental and not intentional. However, the record of the last few years suggests that it is much more than an accidental convergence, and it is disturbing because it reduces the Palestinians' right to self-determination to a mere matter of border dispute, without mentioning which border, or between whom and for what; in fact, that dispute involves the perpetuation of the political and national disfranchisement of the Palestinian people, and that is a major obstacle indeed, not only towards the convening of the international peace conference, or towards bringing about modalities for a sound outcome of a negotiated settlement, but also towards understanding between the United States and the Arab world.

257. I do hope that the United States will reconsider this over-simplification, which seems to be in total harmony with the propagandist line of the Zionist entity.

258. I mention the Zionist entity at this moment deliberately, because the Israeli representative insists on talking about the PLO as a terrorist organization, and unless he respects what the international community has recognized—the PLO—he cannot ask for respect for the name he has assumed for himself.

259. The second cause of disturbance—but it is more than a disturbance, it is revulsion at the historical, if I may say so, hysterical, argument which during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s we thought had been submerged in the process of decolonization throughout Asia, Africa and in many parts of Latin America. Surely it is disturbing that somebody should come here today and talk about desolate lands, about transforming deserts into gardens, repeating and restructuring this old colonial argument, as if Israel now, at a time when colonization has receded into history, wants to project itself as a successful colonization enterprise. It is very disturbing that such arguments of the nineteenth century racial, colonial period should have credence and circulation in this body.

260. I am furthermore disturbed by the claim that there has been a continuous Jewish presence in Palestine and in other Arab countries. Of course there has been a Jewish presence, a Jewish-Arab presence, throughout, and Arabs of Jewish faith are part and parcel of the Arab national community. Therefore, to say that the fact that there are Arab Jews constitutes a claim to separate them into the ghetto of a nationalistic racist State is an insult to the Jewish Arab tradition, to the Arab world in general and to the humanist and integrationist policies and values that we entertain.

261. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation, in a speech earlier this afternoon, responded to the untruths and fallacious arguments of the representative of Israel. However, he has once again given us a version of history; the reason behind that might be his keen interest in showing his credentials as a representative of expansionist and aggressionist Israel.

262. The Israeli representative resorted to the style of the long and short memory in dealing with history. When it is in the interest of Israel to have a long memory, he does that and begins his narration at the year 2000 B.C.; then, in his abridgement of history, he passes quickly over the plight of the Palestinians and jumps directly to the year 1900 A.D.

263. We do not expect the representative of Israel to understand the historic unity between Palestine and Jordan and between the peoples of the two countries. He is used to dealing with Palestinians and Arabs from the point of view of power, occupation and expansion. The logic of the Israeli representative when he tries to refer to Jordan as Palestine is only an attempt to enable Israel to perpetuate its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, to deny the Palestinians their right to their national soil, to deny the responsibility of Israel towards the Palestinian question and to attempt to solve it at the expense of the rights of others.

264. As for the legal relationship between Jordan and Palestine, I should like to draw attention to the following fact: if Jordan is part of Palestine, as the Israeli representative claims, how could part of it be occupied? This contradiction might be accepted only according to Israeli logic, but how can the Israeli aggressors justify their aggression against the Palestinian people?

265. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement in reply.

266. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): What we are here for is to find a proper course and a proper process for a solution. Be that as it may, apparently somebody is trying to divert our attention

from finding a solution. Let me recall that the League of Nations assigned my country, Palestine, a category A Mandate, which meant that the people who lived in Palestine in 1922 were eligible to have their own administration and just needed the know-how.

267. Later the British took over as the Mandatory Power and we were issued with passports that read "British Passport: Palestine". They were issued under the Palestine Citizenship Ordinance. We were Palestinians, and every time we thought we would like to go and visit our relatives in Amman across the river, we needed a visa. So there have been two distinct entities at least since 1922. As I recall, we used to pay one shilling for that visa, and the process took one month. I am sure some of the members of the United Kingdom delegation will remember those things.

268. Thirdly, my country in 1947 had a population that was 66 per cent Arab and 33 per cent Jewish. Yet the United Nations took it upon itself to divide that country arbitrarily. I repeat that what we are here for is to find a way, a system, a process, to resolve the problem and bring peace to the area.

269. With regard to the PLO, of course we are proud, happy and gratified that the General Assembly welcomed the PLO in 1974 and invited us to be here as the representatives of the Palestinian people. What we are more proud of is that the Palestinian people itself has recognized the PLO as its sole and legitimate representative. In 1976, the occupying Power carried out some municipal elections in occupied Palestinian territory. What was the result? I would say that Israel would not dare to repeat that process. If, as PLO supporters in 1976, we received only 85 per cent, Israel, as the occupying Power, knows very well that today 100 per cent of the people would support the PLO, despite Israeli tanks, despite Israeli bayonets and despite the presence of some members of the Israeli Knesset like Kahane and the Tehiya party and all those criminals who collaborated with the Nazis and are perpetuating racism in our country.

270. Let me tell you this. When the United Nations convened the International Conference on the Question of Palestine at Geneva in 1983, there were a number of Jews there. As a matter of fact, our representative at one of the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights held at Geneva was a Palestinian Jew. We could not care less what religion he belongs to. That is his business. We are Palestinians, whether we are Christians, Muslims or Jews. We were brought up in that life. However, how many Israeli Jews were at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine? When they returned, only the Arab was placed in prison. The Jewish Israelis who came to the Conference were not put in prison. Is that not the meanest and lowest form of racism that could be exercised?

271. But again I should like to remind the General Assembly that we are here to find a process, a method, of terminating the misery of our Palestinians. Five million Palestinians are still striving to go back to their homes and live in peace. Chairman Arafat, from this very rostrum, addressed the international community and said that there is plenty of room, that we can all live together without discrimination as to colour, race or church affiliation. I may repeat here that this is what we are striving for: that in Palestine, the land of peace, we may all live as one.

Programme of work

272. The PRESIDENT: I wish to consult the members with regard to our programme of work. We already have 28 speakers who wish to explain their votes on the situation in the Middle East. On the basis of our present experience, it would not be surprising if we also had requests to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I suggest that we defer consideration of agenda item 36 on the situation in the Middle East, until Saturday morning, since the remainder of our work programme is full. I am in the hands of the members. I could go on for 28 hours non-stop, as I did in 1982, but of course I was two years younger then.

273. Is there any objection to the suggestion that we hold a meeting on Saturday morning?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

[2] See A/40/87, annex, resolution AHG/Res.123 (XX).

[3] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[4] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[5] See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August–7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), annex V.

[6] The delegation of Ghana subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[7] See *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, Vienna, 26 March–24 May 1968 and 9 April–22 May 1969* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.V.5), p. 287.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

96th PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 12 December 1984,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

Commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States

1. The PRESIDENT: As members will recall, the General Assembly decided at its 3rd meeting [*para. 154*] that it would hold a plenary meeting today to commemorate, on the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1984/64, the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

2. Ten years ago today, the General Assembly adopted the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*]. This commemoration provides a valuable opportunity for us to assess the global economic system as it has functioned in the past decade. In doing so, we should focus on what has been achieved or left unattended and what needs to be done to enhance international economic co-operation.

3. The essential premise of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was, and still is, the promotion of development and international economic co-operation. Among other things, the charter declares, in its article 24, that "All States have the duty to conduct their mutual economic relations in a manner which takes into account the interests of other countries."

4. The process which led to the adoption on 12 December 1974 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States should be seen in the broader context of the efforts which had culminated a few months earlier in the adoption of a related document, the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order [*resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI)*]

5. The economic crisis of the early 1970s had brought about a new awareness that the international community had to commit itself to the introduction of structural changes in the pattern by which international economic relations were conducted. The important decisions taken by the General Assembly in 1974 were therefore necessary in the interest of our interdependent world.

6. Today it still seems valid to emphasize that matters affecting economic relations among nations cannot be guided by parochial considerations or limited conceptual horizons. Institutions that play a dominant role in these areas should not function only within the original framework that shaped their creation. Rather, they should be responsive to the changing needs and requirements of the countries and peoples which they now serve.

7. The growing importance of the developing countries as a whole in the global economy is perhaps the most significant single element which determines the call for a reorientation of the patterns of international economic relations. The developing countries provide a market for almost a quarter of the exports from the developed countries. Consequently, growth in developing countries favourably affects the economies of developed countries, in terms both of demand and of employment. Conversely, the buoyancy of the economies of the developed countries has a direct bearing on the economic future of the developing countries. In short, the interdependence of our global economy makes it evident that improvements in the world economic situation must be a collective enterprise.

8. The General Assembly has undertaken several initiatives in the past decade to improve the global economic environment. The results of these initiatives have been less than spectacular. The need for a rational exploitation of global resources and the equitable distribution of economic benefits remains an urgent and continuing priority.

9. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States is generally regarded by Governments as an embodiment of cardinal principles which must be allowed to govern inter-State relations. It is also considered to be a reasonable expression of the need for harmonious development in the world economy, as well as for the maintenance of international peace and security.

10. It is in this spirit that I should like on this occasion to appeal to all States, developed and developing, to implement this important instrument—the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

11. I now call on the Secretary-General.

12. The SECRETARY-GENERAL (*interpretation from Spanish*): Ten years ago the General Assembly adopted the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. It was a pronouncement of lasting significance, based on the realization that in a world of growing interdependence, international economic problems could be solved only through greater multilateral co-operation. While some issues arising from this premise may be open to debate, the basic principle articulated by this charter transcends all differences of perceptions and priorities. It is the principle of promoting an economic order based on equity, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest and co-operation among all States, irrespective of their economic and social systems.

13. The last 10 years have been years of much tumult in the economic sphere. They have accentua-

ted certain harsh realities confronting the developing countries, and they have also underscored the need for more systematic co-operation among nations. Faced with this challenge, the world community expects the United Nations to develop the concepts and define the modalities appropriate to such co-operation. The Organization provides the only forum for a comprehensive discussion of issues relating to the long-term prospects for development and to the correction of imbalances in international economic relations. Many of the important economic issues to which the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States addressed itself continue to be on the agenda of the General Assembly. The problems of the least developed among the developing countries remain a subject of special concern, requiring urgent action. The adoption by the General Assembly of a very important declaration, The Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa [*resolution 39/29, annex*], testifies to this concern.

14. In the world of today, the existence of poverty results in a succession of severe economic and social crises for developing countries. These constitute not only a challenge to the international conscience but a threat to international stability as well. We have yet to achieve a new consensus on economic issues in the light of world economic and political realities. This will take time to emerge, but its absence need not prevent progress in critical areas. I believe that positive action in these areas would be the best reaffirmation of the purpose of ensuring a more peaceful and prosperous future for all the peoples of the world.

15. Mr. FISCHER (Austria), President of the Economic and Social Council: The Economic and Social Council, by its resolution 1984/64, decided to recommend to the General Assembly that it commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States in a suitable and appropriate manner at a plenary meeting on 12 December 1984. The General Assembly, in agreeing to this recommendation of the Council, has provided an opportunity to assess the importance of that historic event and to reflect on its continued relevance for our ongoing efforts to cope with the challenges of increasing global economic interdependence.

16. Through the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, its sponsors endeavoured to provide the international community of nations with an effective instrument for the establishment of a new system of international economic relations based on equity, sovereign equality and interdependence of interests of developed and developing countries. It was hoped that the evolution of economic and social principles meeting the requirements of more equitable international relations would make a major contribution to advancing the cause of development and to promoting social progress in larger freedom.

17. Today, 10 years after the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, we have to state that many of these hopes and aspirations remain unfulfilled. Many of our efforts to promote economic and social development in a manner which truly responds to the full dimension of this historic process of change still encounter major difficulties. Some of these difficulties are due to the sheer magnitude and complexity of the problems involved. Others are caused by the diversity of interests and the difference of approach and perspective in pursuing the goal of achieving a more prosperous and more peaceful world.

18. As much as our views may differ on the reasons for the lack of progress in solving the world's pressing economic and social problems, we do, I believe, all agree on the need for closer and more effective international economic co-operation. It is in this sense that the basic aims underlying the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States are as valid today as they were a decade ago.

19. It is also in this sense that we should benefit from this occasion to recommit ourselves to the strengthening of international economic co-operation for development and to making better use of the United Nations as an instrument for such co-operation.

20. The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Ahmed Tawfik Khalil of Egypt, who will speak on behalf of the Group of 77.

21. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): We are gathered today in this forum to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption in 1974 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, in implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1984/64 which, *inter alia*, recommended that the General Assembly, at its thirty-ninth session, should observe this occasion in a suitable and appropriate manner at a plenary meeting. We still recall the eloquent words of the former President of Mexico, Mr. Luis Echeverría Alvarez, when, at Santiago in 1972, before the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, he said: "Let us transfer the concrete principles of solidarity among men to the area of relations among countries". Then he proposed a charter of economic rights and duties, which culminated in the adoption by the General Assembly two years later of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

22. In view of the vital importance attached to this charter and its impact on international economic relations, the States members of the Group of 77 had hoped that enough progress in the implementation of the charter provisions since its adoption 10 years ago would have justified genuine celebration on this occasion. Today, however, we have to content ourselves with the commemoration of the adoption of a charter that remains to be fulfilled.

23. Ten years after the adoption of the resolution, several developed countries have not gone far beyond what in the language of the United Nations could perhaps be termed as merely "having taken note of" the provisions of this universal document. The gap between what the charter spells out concerning the various elements of international economic relations and what has so far been implemented cannot be overlooked or glossed over. To cite some examples, the charter calls for the promotion of rational and equitable economic relations and for the expansion and liberalization of world trade. At the level of implementation, what we really see and experience today is the marked increase in protectionism, which has become more specific in focus, more sectoral in scope and more discriminatory in effect. The growth in protectionism and its existing structures has had a major adverse impact on trade, particularly on the exports of developing countries.

24. Developed countries had pledged, even committed themselves, to desist from imposing new

restrictions and to work towards dismantling existing ones. But the practice still falls far short of a genuine expansion and liberalization of world trade.

25. The charter upholds the right of all States to participate fully in the international decision-making process in the solution of economic, financial and monetary problems. However, the past decade was marked by instability, punctuated by periods of crisis, against which background deficiencies of the international monetary system have become increasingly evident. The severe economic problems faced by developing countries during this period were largely of external origin, resulting primarily from a system in whose creation and operation the developing countries played a small but insignificant role. This is not to deny that this state of affairs has generated a certain impetus to a process of change. The importance of strengthening the role of developing countries in the decision-making processes of multilateral financial institutions has consequently gained a certain momentum. Nevertheless, institutional and policy changes within multilateral financial institutions have tended so far to fall far short of the expectations of developing countries.

26. On the other hand, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, as is well known, underlines the importance of the adjustment in prices of exports from developing countries in relation to prices of imports and calls for the conclusion of more multilateral trade agreements. Nevertheless, the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities[1] has not yet been ratified by the required two-thirds majority to render that fund operational.

27. I shall not dwell here at length on several other articles enshrined in the charter, whether they are related to the elimination of colonialism, *apartheid*, racial discrimination, neo-colonialism and all forms of foreign aggression, occupation and domination, as in article 16; or to the duty to contribute to a balanced expansion of the world economy, as in article 31; or to the promotion of the achievement of general and complete disarmament and utilization of resources thereby released for development, as in article 15. Suffice it to remind ourselves of the recognition by Governments that the charter is a basic document in the field of political and economic relations. There is universal agreement that the charter properly reflects the realities of interdependence, particularly in the area of global economic relations. It underscores the importance of the expansion of international co-operation with a view to bringing about a balance in the world economy.

28. What we really need on an occasion such as today is to stress that good intentions alone are not enough. We need to pause for reflection. We need to ask ourselves, 10 years after the adoption of the charter, where do we stand? Has the charter been fully or adequately implemented? Do developing countries exercise full sovereignty over their natural resources in the context of the present international economic order? Have international economic relations been restructured on an equitable and democratic basis, as provided in the charter? Have global negotiations been launched? And in short, has the general economic situation of the developing countries improved since the adoption of the charter?

29. As the Group of 77 sees it, the answer to all such fundamental questions is, regrettably, in the negative on the whole.

30. The Declaration of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Group of 77, adopted at the meeting held at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 26 to 28 September 1984, succinctly described the critical state of the world economy when it stated:

> "While the economic recovery in developed countries remained uneven and its durability was in no way guaranteed, most developing countries continued to experience stagnant or declining growth rates. The developing countries continued to be confronted with an adverse external environment characterized by declining commodity prices, sharp exchange-rate fluctuations, deterioration in the terms of trade, increased protectionism, very high real interest rates, crushing debt burdens, reverse transfer of financial resources, decline of official development assistance (ODA) in real terms and the resource crisis experienced by the multilateral development financing institutions. The Ministers observed that the ever-widening gap between the developed and developing countries was a result of the inequities and inequalities inherent in the existing system, and that the crisis was not merely a cyclical phenomenon but the manifestation of deep-rooted structural imbalances and disequilibrium. Therefore, they observed that sustained and balanced growth of the international economy required an equitable adjustment process."
>
> "The Ministers reaffirmed their belief in the concept of interdependence as a basis of mutually beneficial co-operation among all countries. They regretted that, while acknowledging interdependence, some developed countries continued to follow policies detrimental and damaging to developing countries. They reiterated that interdependence should lead to co-operative endeavours for the benefit of all countries and should eliminate the widening gap between the developed and developing countries." [*See A/39/536, annex, paras. 8 and 12.*]

31. Developing countries have always expressed and demonstrated not only their will but also their pragmatic attitude and determination to engage in a serious dialogue with their partners from developed countries with a view to the full implementation of the provisions enshrined in various global agreements and documents, such as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade [*resolution 35/56, annex*], all of which seek to establish a new world order in which justice, equity, peace and security could be achieved.

32. On a more optimistic note, let me say in conclusion that despite our frustrations and disappointments, the Group of 77 would also like to seize this opportunity to reiterate its determination to continue to engage in a constructive manner in the review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. We shall pursue our co-operative endeavours—and I underline co-operative—to identify the most appropriate action for the implementation of the charter that would lead to lasting solutions to the grave economic

problems of developing countries within the framework of the United Nations. On behalf of the States members of the Group of 77, I wish to express our sincere hope that the exercise of the review next April will identify the desired goals and that the relevant report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its fortieth session will herald a new era of international understanding and co-operation.

33. The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Natarajan Krishnan of India, who will speak on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

34. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): It gives me great pleasure to address this gathering on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It is fitting that on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations we are meeting to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. The charter represents a landmark in the process which started with the establishment of the United Nations itself—the reassertion of the right of every nation, big or small, rich or poor, endowed or deprived, to full sovereignty and equality. The charter amplifies sovereignty in its economic manifestation, and it is one more step that the international community has taken towards a just and equitable economic order in the world. It seeks to redress the imbalance of rights and duties for those countries upon which a peculiar constellation of historical legacies imposed a perpetuating condition of poverty and deprivation and which were placed at a disadvantage in the prevailing set of international economic relations. In seeking to redress this imbalance, the charter represents a consistent principle of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

35. In spite of the historical significance of its adoption, it is increasingly clear that 10 years later the charter remains largely unimplemented and the world economy continues to suffer from severe structural imbalance, which has been exacerbated by the recent economic crisis of proportions unparalleled since the great depression. The worst sufferers in the global recession have been the developing countries, which are facing increasing balance-of-payments deficits, mounting debt burdens and deteriorating terms of trade along with sharp decreases in development assistance.

36. It should be noted that, while seeking to restore the balance in international economic relations, the charter takes due account of the legitimate interests of the more affluent and industrialized States as well. In fact, it is a remarkably prescient document. Even 10 years ago, it clearly foresaw the increasing interdependence of the world economy, the relationship between peace and development and the need for greater international co-operation for mutual benefit. It is in these basic premises that all our co-operative efforts originate. It is therefore a matter of particular regret that the consensus for development which is embodied in the charter and in so many other documents of the United Nations is itself being laid open to question. Nothing could cause greater harm to international economic co-operation at a time when it is most needed.

37. It is in this spirit that the non-aligned countries express their regret at the very limited response that the request of the Secretary-General for information on the review of implementation has evoked. It is our hope that the proposed meeting of an *ad hoc* intergovernmental committee next year will make possible a careful examination of areas to which greater attention needs to be paid by the international community and will lead to a firm consensus on measures to reach those objectives. We are aware that some countries have reservations on some provisions of the charter. On this occasion we would like to invite them again to join the mainstream of international opinion on economic rights and duties.

38. One area which requires urgent consideration is the liberalization of trade. The provisions in articles 14 and 18 of the charter on increasing the access of exports of developing countries and for preferential treatment for such exports are particularly important. The broad thrust of trade liberalization since the Kennedy and Tokyo rounds seems to have been reversed, and protectionist barriers are taking increasingly arbitrary and discriminatory forms. To restore confidence in the international trading system, it is essential that existing commitments on standstill and rollback of protectionism be urgently implemented. In accordance with article 22 of the charter, a much greater effort is also required to increase the flow of financial resources to developing countries and progressively to reach internationally agreed targets for official development assistance. It is ironical that in the present grave economic conditions a net outflow of capital is taking place from developing countries as a whole.

39. The General Assembly has served to focus the international community's attention on the critical economic situation in Africa. The Prime Minister of India, in his capacity as Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, has expressed the solidarity of the Movement with the efforts of African countries and appealed to all members to join in the efforts to meet the immediate challenge, as well as the long-term task of fostering sustained economic growth. The objective of collective self-reliance through increased economic co-operation among developing countries, as enshrined in the charter, is one of the major principles of the Non-Aligned Movement. In this spirit, we are ready, along with the rest of the international community, to assist in any manner possible.

40. In conclusion, I should like to draw particular attention to article 8 of the charter, which places the highly significant responsibility on all countries to "co-operate in encouraging structural changes in the . . . world economy" in order to facilitate a more rational and equitable system of international economic relations. Article 10 further prescribes that all States "have the right to participate fully and effectively in the international decision-making process in the solution of world economic, financial and monetary problems". It is clear that this is one of the most pressing areas of concern. I need not dwell at length here on the reasons which prompted the heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, at their Seventh Conference, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, to stress the urgent need for the launching of global negotiations and to call for an international conference on money and finance for development.[2] Since that call was made, the need for change, be it described as improvement or reform, has become almost universally accepted. It would be particularly fitting if, on the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the charter, we could reach an understanding on this most pressing area of concern and initiate a process of consultations which would

enable the convening of that international conference on money and finance for development.

41. The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Pascal Gayama of the Congo, Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of December.

42. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Only a few days separate us now from the adoption by the Assembly of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa [*resolution 39/29, annex*]. At a time when, on behalf of the Group of African States, we are undertaking a succinct evaluation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, this coincidence cannot but influence our perceptions.

43. Assuredly, the Declaration just adopted by the General Assembly does not mention this charter, adopted 10 years ago, which in its preamble stated that it is a fundamental purpose of the present charter to promote the establishment of the new international economic order.

44. Nevertheless, for many Africans the norms and principles defined by the charter remain of indisputable validity and retain a usefulness no one can underestimate for the realization of the objectives set forth in the Declaration.

45. Indeed, if the overall economic and social situation of the African continent is very far today from the conditions advocated in the charter when the General Assembly declared itself "desirous of . . . the promotion . . . of the economic and social progress of all countries, especially developing countries", we must certainly see here, above all, an effect of the particularly devastating natural calamities such as drought and desertification which have greatly afflicted the economies whose structures were still far from firm.

46. These natural disasters, however, are not the only factors involved here. They have only added to and aggravated other factors which are equally deplorable, such as laws and practices now in effect in the present international economic order. This being the case, we can ask whether effective implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, if it did not reduce the consequences of the African crisis, at least might have made it possible to discern their symptoms more systematically and to intervene with more effectiveness and assurance.

47. On this point, the Group of African States supports the idea of creating an intergovernmental committee of the whole which we hope would be able to determine the precise relationship between Africa's economic situation and the non-implementation of the charter.

48. It seems necessary for us to stress, on the occasion of this tenth anniversary, that despite the less than receptive atmosphere on the part of some developed countries to the goals and principles of the charter, that charter nevertheless remains more than ever the touchstone for all normative approaches made in recent years to give real meaning to the concept of underdevelopment that can no longer be considered a sad inevitability, but as a relative state, caused by a basically unjust, blind economic system.

49. Through the clarification of ideas and the redistribution of roles that it advocates, the charter offers prospects for lending substance to the concept of the right to development and proposes the implementation of essential structural reforms appropriate for changing the picture of international economic relations.

50. The validity of the charter flows both from the goals that inspired it and from the conditions that made it necessary. The aim it was meant to serve 10 years ago remains as valid as ever.

51. First of all, it seems to us necessary to introduce into the indifferent play of market forces a minimum of ethical considerations such as would serve the goals of justice and equity which are the beginning and the end of any political undertaking. Then, it is important to stress that the conditions that some 10 years ago determined the economic and social crisis of the world have not changed. That crisis affects the developing countries, particularly those of Africa, much more than it does the developed countries. It is the gravest crisis the world has known since the 1930s. Its persistence or its aggravation definitively refuted the subjective theories that attributed all the evils of the situation solely to the rise in oil prices, and placed the responsibility on the developed countries which ceaselessly profit from a situation that is profitable to them in every aspect.

52. Thus the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States has to deal, in the implementation of its basic provisions, with the paralysing inertia, if not with the veiled or declared opposition, of those who since the beginning have seen in it a dangerous revolutionary operation, aimed at sowing chaos and desolation among the wealthier countries. They have therefore made efforts to play down its significance and to reduce its practical effect on those areas of international economic life where an attempt has been made to draw up new rules for the game, as regards production and trade as well as finance and development.

53. In all these areas lively resistance is noted, which does not even leave untouched such basic concepts as that mentioned in article 1 of the charter, "the sovereign and inalienable right [of every State] to choose its economic system as well as its political, social and cultural systems in accordance with the will of its people, without outside interference, coercion or threat in any form whatsoever."

54. There are circumstances also which show us that the provision in article 2, according to which "Every State has and shall freely exercise full permanent sovereignty, including possession, use and disposal, over all its wealth, natural resources and economic activities", is constantly the subject of negative assessment by those States whose technological capacities and economic or military power are considered to give them the right to dispose, for imperialist ends, of the resources and activities of the weaker countries.

55. However, institutions whose liberal intentions and initiatives no one can doubt, such as the World Bank, are saying the same thing when, evaluating the worrying economic situation of Africa, they advocate that international assistance for development should take into account, above all, the priorities and programmes formulated by the countries concerned themselves.

56. In this context, we remain convinced that if the global negotiations had been able to lead to operational agreements in the essential areas of raw materials, trade, development, currency and finance, this would have made it possible to achieve in a co-ordinated way the basic goals and objectives of the

charter, which are reflected in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.

57. Opposition to the charter is shown, finally, in a general retreat from the spirit of co-operation, a retreat characterized by the adoption of protectionist policies, the cut-backs in contributions in the form of public assistance to development and, generally speaking, inadequate efforts to ensure the financing of multilateral development programmes and the re-establishment of bilateral procedures, which are not all free from responsibility in the present crisis of the developing countries in general and African countries in particular.

58. In article 17, the charter clearly states that "International co-operation for development is the shared goal and common duty of all States."

59. The lack of haste shown by our partners in the developed countries with respect to the recommendations of UNCTAD, in particular to the establishment of the Common Fund for Commodities, which is of major interest for Africa, demonstrates the nature of the obstacles that have to be overcome to promote the essential purposes of the charter.

60. There are other measures, such as those provided for in the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries,[3] which interest Africa above all, as most of the least developed countries are found in Africa. The implementation of that Programme is still the subject of discussions.

61. From the sectoral standpoint, the results hoped for from industrial development or agricultural development have not been forthcoming, despite the mobilization of the specialized agencies concerned.

62. Science and technology are important tools for development, as recognized in article 13 of the charter, which states: "Every State has the right to benefit from the advances and developments in science and technology for the acceleration of its economic and social development." Africa, more than other regions concerned, has not been able to profit satisfactorily from this in order to establish the bases for true endogenous development.

63. In sum, confined to a minor role in the redistribution of international economic activities, which are essentially perceived in terms of neo-colonialist schemes, the African continent has not been able, despite its enormous potentialities and resources, to convert itself into a pole of development activities "to contribute to the balanced expansion of the world economy", as article 31 of the charter states, taking due account of the interdependence of the elements which make up the entire international community.

64. Africa had already tried to reformulate the principles of the charter in accordance with its basic priorities through the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted on 29 April 1980.[4] The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, whose twentieth ordinary session was held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, advocated the revitalization of this Plan in the light of the present situation. In this regard, an economic summit conference is scheduled in 1985, which certainly will be able, in addition to dealing with pressing immediate problems, to undertake an evaluation of medium- and long-term projects, such as those for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, as well as of the implementation of sub-regional economic projects.

65. The Lagos Plan of Action, completed by the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, thus constitutes Africa's positive answer to the appeal in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States which embodies these objectives. The effective implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action will make Africa the privileged partner it wishes to become, in the framework of co-operation and the new international economic order.

66. In the area of political independence and sovereignty, we Africans know very well the cost of becoming and acting as a sovereign agent of international law to which the terms of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States would apply.

67. By expanding the horizons of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the charter gives valuable support to all those struggling, as in Namibia and South Africa, for recognition of the inalienable rights of peoples, as article 16 of the charter states clearly when it says:

> "It is the right and duty of all States, individually and collectively, to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid,* racial discrimination, neo-colonialism and all forms of foreign aggression, occupation and domination, and the economic and social consequences thereof, as a prerequisite for development."

It also says that: "No State has the right to promote or encourage investments that may constitute an obstacle to the liberation of a territory occupied by force."

68. Need we stress the extent to which in this context the South African *apartheid* régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia constitute an obstacle to the full satisfaction of the conditions for the application of the charter in Africa?

69. South Africa, which always lags behind an evolution, is here in the paradoxical position of contemporary colonial Powers when, despite the adoption of the mother instrument, the Charter of the United Nations, followed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they did not hesitate to carry out atrocious colonial wars, putting themselves at odds with the juridical instruments they themselves had elaborated.

70. In the final analysis, Africa realizes very well that the principles which should govern international economic relations, peaceful coexistence and the independence of States are disrupted by the tension that persists at present in East-West relations, which some are happy to extend to our continent. The arms race and the attempts to establish spheres of influence that result from it are hardly conducive to the promotion of the provisions of article 15, according to which: "All States have the duty to promote the achievement of general and complete disarmament . . . and to utilize the resources released by effective disarmament measures for the economic and social development . . . ".

71. Among the instruments worked out to supplement the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States has a very significant place.

72. Certainly, the Charter of the United Nations exists, and it already includes among its objectives

"international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social . . . or humanitarian character". Article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations in Chapter IX, on economic and social co-operation among nations, goes even further, and states:

> "With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:
>
> a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;
>
> b. solutions of international, economic, social, health, and related problems . . . "

73. In fact, the Charter of the United Nations had so stated; but if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was needed to specify those stipulations in the area of individual freedoms, no document had yet dealt to this extent with the matter of equality of partners in world development, in the context of a more just and more equitable international order.

74. The norms and principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States refer essentially to the hopes and the underlying realities of the world we live in. The General Assembly reflected their spirit and exigencies when, 10 years ago to the day, on 12 December 1974, it adopted its historic resolution 3281 (XXIX). Human evolution has been marked by moments and acts of universal importance, in which mankind has united in a determination to blaze a path to peace and prosperity by assuring conditions of maximum security and progress.

75. To establish the bases of civilization for all men, all nations to benefit, the crisis through which we have been passing for more than a decade has shown that it no longer suffices to create a technological network in which men are mere puppets in the hands of puppeteers who have no respect for ecology and the environment.

76. The rediscovery of our unity and our common destiny imposes on us other attitudes towards the poverty, hunger and misery which today challenge human ingenuity.

77. The crises and insecurity that characterize the existence of most of our planet, the threats and dangers that haunt our very lives, require that we drastically change our behaviour.

78. For our part, the option is clear: the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States constitutes one of the pivots for a rebirth which the current political, juridical and socio-economic factors make imperative. The new international economic order forms the essential framework for this rebirth.

79. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Abdullah Salah of Jordan, Chairman of the Group of Asian States.

80. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is commemorating today the tenth anniversary of the adoption, in 1974, of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. It is indeed an important occasion, on which the Assembly recalls the spirit on which the charter was based and the objectives for which it was formulated, foremost among which are to strengthen co-operation, to solve all international problems in the area of economic and social rights and to strive towards a new economic order based on justice, equal co-operation, to common interests, interdependence and equal, sovereign rights of States.

81. This charter, which stems from a clear recognition of the importance of economic interdependence between States, strives to create an appropriate international atmosphere for establishing the principles that would serve the progress and economic development of all the States in the world. It stresses particularly the necessity for encouraging and assisting developing countries to achieve a better life for all their peoples through accelerating economic and social development, making available the necessary means for that development through the encouragement of international trade, and facilitating the transfer of technical and financial resources and the required technology. The charter also stresses the importance of reinforcing co-operation among developing countries and calls for the creation of conditions for international co-operation that foster progress and economic stability.

82. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the charter, we would like to commend the initiative that led to its adoption. That initiative was taken by Mr. Luis Echeverría, the former President of Mexico, whose effective role led to further important initiatives being taken on the international scene. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Group of 77, which met in 1974 and were also chaired by the representative of Mexico, initially took an important part in formulating this charter. Since its adoption, there have been important developments on the international economic scene, which must be referred to when the charter is considered. Of particular note are the development and strengthening of co-operation among developing countries and the efforts of the Group of 77 to enhance that co-operation, which extends to different areas, the most important of which are the promotion and development of technical and commercial co-operation among developing countries, in the field of science and technology and the preparation of a system of preferences among developing countries themselves. The means for strengthening this co-operation are still being put into effect through different meetings and through the specialized co-ordinating mechanism within the Group of 77. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has also taken part in establishing a similar co-operation. The two groups, namely the Group of 77 and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, have been active in their efforts to bring about a new international economic order through constructive negotiations between developing and industrialized countries. Of note also were the results of the North-South dialogue and the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. A historic achievement was the adoption of the Convention on the Law of the Sea. After prolonged and difficult negotiations, the overwhelming majority of States of the world joined those negotiations and acceded to the Convention. There was also the establishment of the Common Fund for Commodities.

83. The global negotiations between developing and developed countries are stalled. Those negotiations are aimed at establishing a new international economic order that would lead to stability and an improvement in the international economic situa-

tion. We hope that those negotiations will be resumed as soon as possible, as the present economic conditions call for expediting the common efforts of States to contain the current international economic crisis and the negative impact of this crisis on developing countries. We cannot, of course, talk about the charter on this occasion without referring to the developing countries. Obviously the developing countries suffer more than other countries from this crisis. The economies of those countries are experiencing negative growth rates, if not recession. At a time when the burden of servicing the foreign debt is also increasing and when participation in international trade is becoming more and more limited, there is no doubt that, among measures aimed at the liberalization of international trade, the most important measures are those that favour the exportation of industrial products from developing countries to industrialized countries. We also have to eliminate protectionism, intensify the transfer of financial resources and loan concessions and improve the terms of lending. While we welcome the signs of recovery in the economies of industrialized countries, we hope that a similar recovery will occur in the economies of developing countries.

84. Working with a positive spirit and with constructive co-operation is the best way to achieve our objectives and to implement the articles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which is based on the Charter of the United Nations itself.

85. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States.

86. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The socialist countries on whose behalf I am speaking—the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic—on this tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States have the honour to make the following statement.

87. The Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States is one of the most important basic instruments of the United Nations in the economic sphere. The importance of the charter lies primarily in the fact that, along with the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order [*resolution 3201 (S-VI)*], it has determined the main areas for restructuring international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. An evaluation of the implementation of the charter is in essence an evaluation of the progress achieved by the world community towards implementing the ideas of the new international economic order and of the difficulties which hamper the process of democratization of international economic relations.

88. The particular concern of the socialist countries, in a profound objective evaluation of the results of the implementation of the charter over the last 10 years, is based on their sincere desire, along with all other countries, to take concrete, purposeful steps to restructure international economic relations on a just, democratic basis.

89. The principles and provisions of the charter determine not merely economic, but also political, relations among States. Equality, the recognition of the total sovereignty of States in their economic activities, the inadmissibility of any interference in the internal affairs of other States, peaceful coexistence and the duty of States to promote the implementation of general and complete disarmament—these political principles of the charter are fully sympathized with and supported by the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations.

90. However, the process of international détente, which in the mid-1970s was marked by an expansion and sustained development of economic, scientific, technological and cultural relations and links among States, has been disrupted because of the action of the imperialist States.

91. The policy adopted by the United States of America in the late 1970s and early 1980s to change, to its advantage, the existing military and strategic balance and its desire to attain a dominating position in the world had an extremely negative impact on the development of normal relations among States. That policy flagrantly conflicts with the Charter of the United Nations and with the basis of international economic relations which is set forth in chapter I of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and also the provisions of its articles 1, 4, 15 and 26.

92. As a result of the aggressive policy of the imperialist States, a dangerous situation has been created in the world. As was stressed in the communiqué of the thirty-ninth session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance [*CMEA*] at Havana, the intensification by these forces of the arms race is one of the most important reasons for the deepening of political and economic instability in the world, which has increased the danger of nuclear war, threatening the very existence of mankind and imposing an increasing burden on the peoples of the world because it diverts enormous material and financial resources and slows down economic and social progress. The member countries of CMEA believe that the implementation of realistic measures to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament is a pressing task.

93. Of particular value for putting into practice the provisions of the charter concerning the maintenance of international peace and security could be the implementation of the specific proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries set forth in decisions of the high-level Economic Conference of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, held in Moscow from 12 to 14 June 1984 [*see A/39/323*]; the proposal by the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty to the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] regarding negotiations on the freezing and the reduction of military expenditures, dated 5 March 1984;[5] the Prague Political Declaration adopted at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty on 5 January 1983;[6] the communiqué of the thirty-seventh session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, dated 20 October 1983;[7] and the many other joint instruments of the socialist countries regarding the halting of the arms race, the non-increase in and reduction of

military expenditures and the move towards disarmament in order to ensure that the resources released may be used for purposes of social and economic development, particularly that of the developing countries.

94. The basic purposes of the charter are also to promote the establishment of the new international economic order, to strengthen international co-operation for the purposes of development and to resolve the basic impediments to the economic development of the developing countries.

95. Now, 10 years after the adoption of the charter and of the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, there has been virtually no real progress in restructuring international economic relations on a just, democratic basis. A start in this process could be global negotiations on the most pressing world economic problems, in keeping with General Assembly resolution 34/138. However, since the adoption of that resolution, not only have we not seen any positive progress on this matter but we have witnessed attempts to deny the agreements already achieved. The deadlock on the launching of global negotiations is due to the reluctance of imperialist circles to give up their privileged position in the world capitalist economy. Their policy is aimed not merely at maintaining but also at extending their neo-colonial exploitation of the developing countries and at continuing to drain those countries of colossal financial and material resources.

96. The socialist countries firmly support the speedy launching in the United Nations of global negotiations, in keeping with the decisions taken by the Organization, with the participation of all States and taking into account their legitimate interests.

97. As was emphasized in the Declaration adopted at the high-level Economic Conference of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance entitled "The maintenance of peace and international economic co-operation" [*ibid., annex II*], the member countries of CMEA are consistent advocates of the adoption of effective decisions and actions aimed at eliminating any kind of exploitation in international economic relations; ensuring unimpeded international scientific and technological co-operation; eliminating discrimination, artificial impediments and unequal exchanges in commercial relations; and establishing an economically fair system of justified pricing for commodities, food and manufactured goods and, with this in mind, monitoring more closely the activities of the transnational corporations.

98. They advocate streamlining monetary relations and they are opposed to any policy driving up interest rates. They advocate normalization of the terms of granting credit, so that such terms, particularly with regard to the indebtedness of the developing countries, will not be used as a means of exerting political pressure and interfering in the internal affairs of others.

99. The socialist countries are profoundly convinced that acceleration of the development of the newly liberated States and the attainment by them of economic independence are possible only by radically breaking off unjust economic relations inherited from the colonial past. It is precisely that approach that is reflected in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

100. Recently, increased pressure has been placed on the developing countries by the imperialistic States to force them to give up progressive social and economic transformations, to reduce the size of the public sectors of their economies, to review their national plans and development programmes, to rescind legislation that seeks to protect their national industries and to open the door to the uncontrolled predominance of foreign private capital.

101. This pressure is an open manifestation of latter-day neo-colonialism, and it grossly violates the provisions of the charter, in particular articles 1, 7, 10, 16 and 24.

102. Accordingly, the establishment of effective control over the activities of transnational corporations is particularly important in order to limit their harmful effect on international relations and development. The well-known "package proposal" of the Chairman of the special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations is a realistic basis for concluding work on a code of conduct for transnational corporations. Its adoption could be an important step towards implementing the relevant provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

103. The socialist countries strictly abide by the progressive principles of the charter and in a practical manner are promoting their implementation.

104. This is shown in their political support for the just demands of the developing countries struggling for economic decolonization, for the elimination from international economic relations of diktat, blackmail and threat, and for the development of broad-based, economically advantageous and equitable international economic co-operation.

105. The socialist countries are giving the developing countries all-round broad-based assistance, as far as they are able, in forms that reflect their socialist structure, the effectiveness of which has been acknowledged by the developing countries themselves. This is graphically illustrated by facts relating to this assistance that have been referred to by a number of socialist countries in the United Nations.

106. As far as the contents, principles and goals are concerned, trade and economic, scientific and technological co-operation between the socialist countries and the developing countries constitutes a new type of international economic relations countering the system imposed by imperialism, which is one of exploitation of the natural and human resources of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The nature and type of co-operation that exists between the socialist countries and the newly liberated countries are fully in accordance with the provisions of the charter, in particular articles 4, 14, 18 and 19, and represent a basic contribution by the socialist countries towards the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and towards a restructuring of international economic relations on a just and equitable basis.

107. The assistance given by the socialist countries promotes progressive structural transformations in the economies of the developing countries and makes a substantial contribution towards their attainment of economic independence. With the participation and assistance of the socialist countries, many hundreds of enterprises have been built and are being built—for example, in the fields of metallurgy, energy, mining and light industry—the transfer of

technology on concessional terms is being carried out, and there is widespread training of nationals.

108. Foreign trade between the socialist countries and the developing countries is increasing apace. In their trade policies, the socialist countries strictly abide by and will always abide by the principles of the charter as regards the inadmissibility of any discrimination in international trade and in other areas of economic co-operation, as well as the need for developing international trade on a basis of equality and mutual advantage, irrespective of differences in political, economic and social systems.

109. The increase of protectionism in the developed capitalist countries has seriously hampered international trade and economic co-operation as a whole, as has the use by imperialistic countries of sanctions and embargoes of various kinds. The use of economic pressure for political purposes, despite the clear prohibition of such measures in articles 16 and 32 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and the practice of sanctions, blackmail, blockade and other means of economic coercion have become extremely widespread. In this connection, of great importance is the adoption by the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session of resolutions entitled "Confidence-building in international economic relations" and "Economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries", and the adoption by the Second Committee, at the thirty-ninth session, of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.98,[8] on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, resolutions which seek to oppose the use of measures to exert pressure on the developing countries or to interfere in their internal affairs. The fact that many imperialistic countries voted against those resolutions shows that the policies of sanction and blockade are part of their foreign policy strategy. This is a gross violation not merely of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, but also of the Charter of the United Nations.

110. An important contribution towards the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States is the co-operation of socialist countries within the framework of CMEA.

111. The socialist countries have created a new type of international economic integration which is an example of genuinely equitable and mutually advantageous co-operation among all countries. The affinity in political and socio-economic goals of these States makes it possible for the member countries of CMEA to move successfully towards a radical solution of a whole range of socio-economic problems.

112. A new stage in economic socialist integration was embarked upon at the high-level Economic Conference of the member countries of CMEA, which laid down the basic areas for mutual economic co-operation for the long term.

113. As was stressed in the statement adopted at the Conference, on basic lines for further developing and intensifying economic, scientific and technological co-operation among the member countries of CMEA,

> "consistent implementation of the decisions adopted will give a new and important impetus to the further progressive development of their economies and to mutual co-operation, enhance the prestige and appeal of socialism in the world, and further expand and strengthen the unity of the CMEA member countries, joined in a community of fundamental class interests and linked by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism" [*ibid., annex I*].

114. The present tense political situation, the disruption by the imperialist States of world economic relations, the absence of real progress towards the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis: all this has further increased the significance of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

115. The communiqué issued after the recent meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held on 3 and 4 December 1984 at Berlin, emphasized that the States represented at that meeting condemned the imperialist policy of force and expressed their solidarity with and support for peoples fighting for their freedom, the strengthening of their independence and their socio-economic progress; they took note of the important role played by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in fighting for the elimination of the danger of war, the halting of the arms race, disarmament and the improvement of international political and economic relations; and they expressed opposition to any forms of domination and exploitation by States [*see A/39/763, annex*].

116. The socialist countries believe that the task of the comprehensive review of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States that is to take place in 1985 will be to promote the elimination of the obstacles to the effective implementation of the charter's provisions and to do everything possible to ensure that the progressive principles of the charter, which seek to bring about a radical improvement in international economic relations, are implemented.

117. The PRESIDENT: Because of our heavy programme of work for this afternoon's meeting, this commemorative meeting of the General Assembly must be completed this morning. I therefore appeal to representatives to make their statements as brief as possible. I also propose that, if there is no objection, the list of speakers be closed now.

It was so decided.

118. The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Henri A. M. Guda of Suriname, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Latin American States.

119. Mr. GUDA (Suriname): Today we commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States by the General Assembly at its 2315th meeting, held on 12 December 1974. As Chairman of the Group of Latin American States for the month of December 1984, I therefore wish to make the following observations on behalf of our group of States on this solemn occasion.

120. Article 34 of this charter stipulates that:

> "An item on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States shall be included in the agenda of the General Assembly at its thirtieth session, and thereafter on the agenda of every fifth session. In this way a systematic and comprehensive consideration of the implementation of the Charter, covering both progress achieved and any improvements and additions which might become necessary, would be carried out and appropriate measures recommended. Such consideration should take into account the evolution of all the economic, social, legal and other factors related to the principles upon which the present Charter is based and on its purpose."

121. However, the General Assembly in its resolution 37/204 requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the implementation of this charter for consideration by the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1984.

122. Before the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States is considered, it is deemed both necessary and useful to present a brief overview of the background against which it was proposed, promoted and adopted.

123. In 1971, President Luis Echeverría of Mexico expressed the opinion that the plight of the developing world would be served if and when the economic rights and duties of States were codified by the nations of the world. He reached a consensus on this matter with Brazil and Chile, documentation of which was approved by the Group of Latin American States prior to the planning session of the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which was held at Santiago from 13 April to 21 May 1972.

124. At that session, UNCTAD took up President Echeverría's idea and established a working group to prepare a draft charter for submission in its final version to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. The working group was instructed to use as a basis the principles adopted at the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the suggestions made at the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the Declaration and Principles of the Action Programme of Lima[9], the principles set forth in the Charter of Algiers[10] and the documents of the Second United Nations Development Decade. After many obstacles had been overcome and after an extended mandate, a final report was requested from the working group for the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

125. On 12 December 1974, the General Assembly adopted the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, contained in its resolution 3281 (XXIX).

126. What has been its effect? What progress has since been made?

127. In our opinion, the charter placed special emphasis on the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States, the equality of rights, the promotion of international social justice and the abstention by States from attempts to seek hegemony and spheres of influence. Our Governments have regarded and continue to regard this charter as an adequate instrument both for the harmonious development of the world community and for the maintenance of international peace and security.

128. But, on balance, it appears that the charter has remained unimplemented in general. If we review the fundamentals of economic relations and the economic rights and duties of States as laid down in the charter, we cannot but be disappointed. Intervention in the internal affairs of States and economic coercion still take place in many parts of the world, thereby threatening the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political and economic independence of States. Disputes are still not being settled peacefully in many instances and international obligations are often not fulfilled in good faith.

129. The Secretary-General in his report to the General Assembly on the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States states, *inter alia:*

> "Since the adoption of the Charter . . . considerable progress has been made with regard to the lowering of tariffs to trade . . . Parallel with that progress, however, has been the marked increase in protectionism, which has become more specific in focus, more sectoral in scope and, in general, more discriminatory in its effect. It now appears that protectionism is geared not only to the defence of domestic markets but also, in certain cases, to the capture of foreign markets by means of export subsidies . . . . The growth in protectionism and its existing structures have had a major impact on trade, particularly on the exports of developing countries. . ." [*See A/39/332, para. 6.*]

It is now generally recognized that protectionism is especially harmful to the trade and development of developing countries and that measures should be taken as a matter of urgency to ensure the removal of all impediments to trade.

130. This is seen as an important obstacle on the road to implementation of the provisions of the charter. We of the Group of Latin American States are of the opinion that too much damage has been done to our economies by the open or covert protectionism existing in the world today.

131. The pressure exerted by the reduced prices of raw materials and commodities, the excessive rise in prices of imports, which are mostly quoted in the strong United States dollar, the necessary loans for development and the debt-servicing and amortization costs, that pressure has been too much to bear and has devastated our economies. It is now widely known that the external trade balance for 19 countries in Latin America which had a surplus of more than $US 13 billion in 1980 changed into a negative balance of over $US 1 billion in 1982; while, compared to previous years, the prices of 14 out of 18 main export products from this group of States fell in 1982 by as much as a quarter. In the meantime, the total Latin American debt amounts to three times the value of exports from this region.

132. With regard to the generalized system of preferences, it was agreed after a review by the Special Committee on Preferences that the objectives of the system had not been fully achieved and that the duration of the system should be continued beyond the initial period. Although the amount of trade carried out under the system has been increasing, it still represents a little less than one quarter of the preference-giving countries' dutiable imports from beneficiaries. We are of the opinion that the system should be expanded and liberalized.

133. With regard to the international monetary system, the Secretary-General's report stated: "The severe economic problems faced by developing countries during the period under review were largely of external origin and partly attributable to the workings of a system in whose creation and operation developing countries played no significant role." [*Ibid., para. 10.*] If any change is to be made in this regard it is imperative that developing countries play a greater role in the decision-making process of the multilateral financial institutions. To a certain extent, this already seems to be materializing; however, not to an extent satisfactory to our group.

134. Aid to the developing world has been slow over the last few years and has, in fact, been

overshadowed by private bank lending, carrying high interest rates. However, funds disbursed through multilateral financial institutions grew rapidly in the eight years from 1974 through 1982. In our opinion, these institutions have started to move in the right direction with some positive initiatives. They could, and indeed should, play an important catalytic role in development financing in the near future. Their resource base should, therefore, be expanded. It is unfortunate that the replenishment process of these institutions has met with so many obstacles and shortfalls.

135. In general, it can be stated that our group of developing countries has had some measure of success in shifting the ownership of production facilities to our countries. The concept of establishing joint ventures seems to be preferred in some instances, especially in manufacturing, and certainly where know-how is externally controlled and markets are situated abroad. Therefore, transnational corporations can still exercise effective control over local affiliates. But some progress has been achieved in this sector. It is encouraging that many of our countries have been able to ensure, through general measures or individual agreements, that the affiliates of transnationals operating in our countries indeed contribute to national development. Performance requirements and effective transfer of technology are in many instances more or less standard practices. Understandably, we consequently take a great interest in a code of conduct on transnational corporations.

136. It is not our intention to discuss all aspects of the charter at this time. We have highlighted some aspects which, in our opinion, needed special attention today. The Group of Latin American States reaffirms its support for the charter, which aims at restructuring the existing international economic order to bring justice, development, peace and stability to the world.

137. The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Hans-Werner Lautenschlager of the Federal Republic of Germany, Chairman of the Group of Western European and Other States.

138. Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States.

139. An anniversary lends itself to both a retrospective view and a look ahead into the future. Whoever sets out to chronicle the history of the North-South relationship in the 1970s will certainly have to mark 12 December 1974 as an outstanding date. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted on that day, provides us with a concise record of the concepts which have guided our third-world partners in the North-South dialogue, on which these concepts have their bearing. It would be less than honest to pass over in silence the fact that not everyone among us has been able to accept the charter in all its parts. However, as a manifestation of the political will of a majority of United Nations Member States it deserves respect.

140. As a landmark, it justifies our looking back at the ground covered since 1974 in the dialogue between North and South. Nobody can deny that we have jointly achieved significant progress on substantive questions as well as on the ways and modalities by which the dialogue is carried on. Developed and developing countries may still be separated by different views, but preparedness for co-operation has become the basis of our actions, not least in the United Nations system. The most conspicuous testimony to this is the fact that today we are able to adopt nearly all resolutions that are relevant to the North-South relationship by consensus. This was borne out convincingly in the case of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, which we adopted a few days ago [*resolution 39/29, annex*].

141. As I have already mentioned, an anniversary also invites a look ahead. The progress achieved in the course of the last 10 years does not warrant any complacency. The problems of the developing countries are multitude, and the overall picture has become more complex. The challenge to the international community, however, remains unchanged. We have come to understand that interdependence is not a hollow slogan. If we want to master the pressing problems confronting us, if we want to overcome poverty, hunger and distress, then we must act jointly. Only joint action will bring us nearer to our goal of genuine and lasting partnership between North and South—a goal to which we are all committed. The progress achieved in recent years should encourage us to continue along the way we have embarked upon.

142. The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Saoud Bin Salim Bin Hassan Al-Ansi of Oman, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

143. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the Group of Arab States, which my delegation has the honour to represent this month, we are pleased to participate with the rest of the world today in commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. It is not often that we in the United Nations commemorate positive achievements in the work that has extended over nearly 40 years.

144. Most of the items on the agenda relate usually to conflicts, wars or differences in the social, economic and political spheres. The present occasion is a positive landmark in the course of work of the international Organization, as we commemorate today the passage of 10 years since the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and review together what has been achieved and what should have been achieved in this regard.

145. The adoption by the General Assembly of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States by its resolution 3281 (XXIX)—and resolution 3201 (S-VI) is relevant—in fact acknowledged the importance and greatness of the Charter of the United Nations itself, which is designed primarily and fundamentally to maintain international peace and security and to achieve international co-operation for the solution of mankind's social, economic and political problems. This charter is inspired in its preamble by the lofty, great principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, which we all cherish.

146. The world order with its social, economic and political aspects is a single indivisible whole. If any part of that order malfunctions, the other parts will be undermined under the influence of that malfunctioning part, and the economic order in this regard surely plays the same role. If all the elements of that order function properly, then the whole will function properly. Is there anybody who expects that the world will witness stability in the political and social

spheres in the absence of an economic order based on justice and understanding among all the countries of the world? Can man in any part of the world live in isolated economic stability while his fellow man in other parts of the world dies of hunger and thirst?

147. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was adopted to consolidate the principle of justice in the economic sphere. It also reflects deeply the new international economic order energetically sought by the developing countries to take into account the development of all economic, social and legal factors and other factors of relevance to the principles on which the charter is based and to its genuine aim: to define the most suitable measures for its implementation and to find lasting solutions to the grave problems, especially to those problems afflicting developing countries Members of the United Nations. These countries look forward to the day when they will witness the fruit of continuous work and positive dialogue with the other parties concerned.

148. Surely, no one disputes the importance of this question, coming as it does in the wake of a long era marked by the exploitation of the resources and wealth of the third-world countries which today find themselves facing new realities and evolving economic conditions requiring that they demonstrate more care and diligence, lest they lose the opportunity. The new international economic order serves not only the developing countries but, at the same level, the developed countries. The development of the economies of the developing countries will open new vistas to the benefit of all countries of the world, regardless of their economic systems.

149. The Group of Arab States, which is made up of developing countries, and in turn falls within the scope of the Group of 77, is gratified and pleased to join the world in commemorating the tenth anniversary of the adoption of this charter and hopes that this anniversary will move all the countries of the world to more action and to constructive dialogue excluding marginal differences, with the aim of achieving a more peaceful and prosperous future.

150. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In response to a recommendation of the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly is commemorating today the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. In so doing, it is reliving one of the great moments in the life of the Organization.

151. This, to be sure, is a ceremonial occasion, but it is also a political act of clear unmistakable meaning. Paying a tribute to this basic instrument of relations among States means reaffirming the commitment of the United Nations to the principles that gave it birth and reaffirming the economic reordering of international society.

152. Indeed, the Charter is the culmination of a long process of developing awareness of the deep injustices which survived political decolonization and aggravated inequalities among nations. It also constitutes a tangible, specific response to the conclusion of the cycle initiated at Bretton Woods and to the disarticulation of the economic order designed in the wake of the great conflagration.

153. The expansion of the society of States which took place for three decades had not been in harmony with an adjustment of the policies or the institutions conceived for the stability and the recuperation of the post-war period. Quite to the contrary, the interests of the emerging countries had been ignored and progress confined to a small group of industrialized economies. Progress for the rest was barely marginal.

Mr. Gumucio Granier (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

154. The developing world had discovered that political liberation was not necessarily accompanied by economic liberation. On the other hand, the rigidity of the system and the competition created between the main actors on the international economic scene had led to the violation of the rules which had been agreed upon and to the establishment of the disorder which lasts to this very day.

155. The initiative in working out the charter and the efforts to promote the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order took place in the same historical period and have the same purpose. An epoch of growth that was intensive and at the same time unbalanced had concluded, and it was urgently necessary to establish on the basis of mutual agreement the foundations of universal, shared development.

156. It was necessary to reconstitute rationally the organization of the world economy, based on the needs and potential of all countries. The changes in the political structure of the society of States had to be reflected in the economic sector in order to ensure the full exercise of sovereignty within a truly democratic international system.

157. Demands for a new international economic order were formulated at the beginning of the crisis in anticipation of the catastrophe we are faced with today. The suspension, in 1971, of the convertibility of the dollar into gold, the pivot of the international monetary system, heralded the collapse of the established order. Subsequently, protectionist measures, financial disruption, generalized inflation, the dislocation of international trade and the world-wide insufficiency of the means of production occurred, which led to an unprecedented concentration of resources and to unacceptable conditions of poverty and want in the majority of nations.

158. During the 20 years which preceded the charter initiative, world production increased threefold and the larger part of the industrial capacity of the world today was established. It might have been supposed that the scientific and technological revolution of the present-day world, which took man into space and by the same token made possible the annihilation of man, would have served his redemption. This would have required only a little intelligence and solidarity, but that was what the most powerful lacked.

159. As various delegations have mentioned at this session, on 19 April 1972, Mexico proposed the preparation of a charter of economic rights and duties of States, presaging the hour of change in Latin America and our own country. The validity of a dependent and frequently repressive development model having been exhausted, we were trying, through a democratic opening and just participation in the world economy, to overcome centuries of backwardness and enter into an era of full autonomy, a new stage of civilization.

160. The charter was to many countries both a national definition and a project for international

reform. It was a consistent, well-reasoned offer from the working peoples to the owner peoples, as it were. It offered the possibility of a new social contract that would have made possible, had it been heeded, progress for all with dignity for each.

161. It is not a coincidence that the proposal to work out the charter was presented by a country threatened by foreign intervention, and where those threats were confirmed by the cruel overthrow of a democratic nationalist régime. Struggles for economic justice are inseparable from the defence of basic human rights and the sovereignty of States and nations.

162. During the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held from 13 April to 21 May 1972 at Santiago, we set forth the urgent need to strengthen the precarious juridical foundations of the international economy. We affirmed that neither a just order nor a stable world would be possible until the rights and obligations protecting weak States were defined and the democratic principles on which the Organization is based were given tangible form and effect in the area of economic relations.

163. We said that our era was marked by a worldwide struggle for development in which every form of colonialism or dependence would have to be discarded. We denounced the tendency to relegate to the sidelines problems of productivity and employment generated in the industrial economies, the price of which was the serious impoverishment of the majority, and we proposed the basis for an era of genuine economic co-operation based on equality and in the mutual interest of all nations.

164. The value and validity of the principles we set forth at that time have been confirmed with the years. They resulted from a calm, objective analysis of the world economy and its perspectives, and what has occurred in the meantime has shown many times over how right was our initiative and how obstinately wrong the opposition to it.

165. The picture we foresaw a decade ago has materialized in such a serious form that, we must confess now, we did not even imagine at that time how frighteningly true it was to prove. The economic crisis has come about and been institutionalized, as it were, as a progressively spreading world-wide phenomenon, whose most severe effects can be seen in the developing countries, but which no people escapes. This is indeed, basically, a structural disorder, which grievously wastes the great accumulated potential of nature and the abilities of man.

166. The distribution of the world income by regions, social groups and individuals is irrefutable proof of disregard of the basic principles of the United Nations. The ruin of whole countries, owing to the arbitrary vicissitudes of foreign debt, the depression experienced by most economies, unemployment rates, the abysmal level of hunger and ill health and the recurrent reductions in world production levels should force us to react in a responsible way.

167. Unfortunately, the response to the economic crisis has been the dismantling of the institutions we established to confront such crises. The principles of the new international economic order are disregarded, the provisions of the charter we are commemorating today are ignored, the North-South dialogue is trivialized, the International Development Strategy is not complied with, the commitment to global economic negotiations is not honoured, the International Conference on Money and Finance for Development is postponed, the code of conduct for transnational corporations is rejected, the immediate adoption of measures to alleviate the serious effects of the crisis is resisted, international economic co-operation is paralysed, a humiliating bilateralism is practised and multilateralism is deliberately sabotaged. These are indisputable facts which provide clear evidence of persistent conscienceless behaviour.

168. These phenomena are greatly aggravated by the recurrent tensions between East and West. Their competition for world domination and the incredible consequences of the arms race have made all countries indeed into silent tributaries of militarism and have made all their peoples hostages of a nuclear economy which threatens to destroy everything tomorrow, and today allows for precious little growth indeed.

169. On behalf of the States Members which are members of the Group of 77, a draft resolution entitled "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States" was introduced to the General Assembly. It is proposed in the draft resolution that, because of the deep concern at the gravity of the world economic situation, a thorough and systematic review of the implementation of this instrument be made in order to identify the most appropriate means to ensure its viability. The task would be entrusted to an *ad hoc* intergovernmental committee of the whole, which would meet for three weeks in 1985. That would be the best opportunity to begin the reversal of prevailing trends.

170. We fervently hope that the essential unity of the developing countries, those who promote the principles of the Organization, will overcome the obstacles cast in our path by a scarcely dissimulated neo-colonialism. We hope that we may build, with full exercise of independence by all and full recognition of the interrelationships of our objectives, an economic society that will effectively utilize the resources of this earth and its people to achieve a development based on genuine peace, a peace which will be reflected in equitable progress.

171. We repeat today, as we did 10 years ago, the commitment of Mexico to the United Nations, and recall the words of our President, Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado:

> "The crisis of the world economy is breaking down the post-war system established to orient and promote the expansion of production. This can be dramatically seen in the exhausting of the mechanisms and models and the prolonged deterioration of trade and exchanges, and a sequel of inequality, increasing obstacles and backwardness, to an extent that threatens an economic deterioration of unforeseeable consequences.
>
> "It is urgent to reactivate the productive forces and the exporting power of the developing countries, to extend the horizon of the economic and social progress of the world, to revitalize international co-operation, to initiate the series of global negotiations for development. We must admit that interdependence implies responsibilities and benefits for all States, in order that development may be translated into stability and constitute a collective interest of the community of nations. The objective of establishing a new international economic

order is not to divide the world into antagonistic poles of development. It is not an exclusive project; it is an integrating process.

"International co-operation for development is one of the basic mainstays and objectives of the foreign policy of Mexico. We are convinced, and have been for a long time, that only through conscientious responsible practice of such co-operation will it be possible to aspire to live in the future in an international order that is more just and equitable."

172. That is the unswerving position of my country in the struggle in which we will never waver.

173. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Government of the Republic of Cuba attaches high priority to the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States as the important tool it is in the struggle of the developing countries to achieve more just and equitable international economic relations within the framework of the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. In the 10 years following the adoption of that document, international economic relations have constantly deteriorated and international co-operation has sunk to the lowest level in its history. This situation affirms more strongly than ever the validity of the charter and the need for an analysis of the failure to implement it, which would contribute to identifying once again the causes that have given rise to the appearance and the aggravation of many negative phenomena and trends such as we witness in the world economy today.

174. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was conceived as a valuable legal instrument for governing economic relations between States regardless of their economic and social régimes, their size or their levels of development. The close link between its postulates and the realities of the contemporary world and with the main instruments that govern the destiny of the Organization, including the Charter of the United Nations, make it a document of great importance indeed. They give it a significance that goes far beyond the conditions of the international situation in which it was adopted.

175. The charter was conceived for the purpose of contributing in a decisive way to the economic and social progress of peoples, of speeding their economic growth and eliminating the gap between the developed and the developing countries, as well as eliminating the main obstacles to the economic progress of the developing countries. In this context, the preamble of the charter reaffirms the need for establishing a more just and equitable economic and social order, to which end it recommends the achievement of a new sort of international economic relations and the promotion of structural changes in the world economy, as well as the creation of conditions permitting the expansion of trade, the strengthening of the economic independence of the developing countries and the promotion of international economic relations which would take into account the specific needs of the developing countries and the differences that separate them in the economic sphere from developed countries.

176. We now note with alarm that international economic relations, instead of showing progress—as foreseen by the charter—towards substantial improvement, which would promote the development of the so-called third-world countries, are radically deviating from this objective, and instead of promoting the restructuring of international economic relations to make them more compatible with the interests and development needs of the so-called third world, these tend to reinforce existing unjust and inequitable structures.

177. The imposition of protectionist measures, aggravated by new methods which do greater harm to the trade interests of the developing countries, the reduction in the prices of the raw materials and commodities which these countries export, together with excessive increases in the prices of their imports, high rates of interest on loans and increased expenditure on amortization and debt-servicing, among other negative elements, have reached an unprecedented level in recent years and have contributed to the fact that the effects of the crisis in the world capitalist economy are being felt more strongly by the third world. The spiral of external indebtedness and debt-servicing, the increasing deterioration from the point of view of the developing countries of the trade-price relationship, their difficulties in gaining access to resources, capital and technology are but a pale reflection of the critical situation these countries are experiencing.

178. The way in which the principles embodied in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States are applied at present is very different from what it was in 1974, not because there has been an improvement in their application, but because the failure to apply them is even more flagrant than it was then.

179. Thus, no progress has been made in the international co-operation advocated in the charter, which was to have taken place within the framework of the United Nations. Since 1979, when, on the initiative of the sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, the General Assembly adopted resolution 34/138, the member countries of the Group of 77 have worked assiduously and in a flexible manner to ensure the launching of global negotiations which would make a decisive contribution to confrontation of the main problems of the economies of the developing countries and to the just and democratic restructuring of international economic relations. In this context, we have been confronted for five years now with inflexible, discriminatory, delaying actions designed to change substantially the very nature of those negotiations.

180. At the same time, the international economic conferences held within the framework of the United Nations system, which should have made substantial contributions to the development of the so-called third-world countries—including, most recently, the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the Fourth General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Code of Conduct for Transnational Corporations and the examination and evaluation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade—have not had any tangible results. On the contrary, it is clear that these efforts become more negative with every passing day and are facing increasing difficulties and an ever-growing number of obstacles, instead of being positive and heading towards a system of reasonable and effective international co-operation.

181. The Cuban delegation supports the draft resolution on the charter which was presented by the Group of 77 to the Second Committee, and we feel that it is very important to establish an *ad hoc* intergovernmental committee of the whole to meet in 1985 to examine exhaustively and systematically the application of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States in order to identify the most appropriate means of applying the charter that could lead to lasting solutions to the serious economic problems of the developing countries.

182. In sum, the decade which has passed since the adoption of the charter shows the full validity of all its provisions and the need to strengthen the efforts of the international community to implement these provisions. Otherwise, the development of peoples will become more remote with each succeeding day and we shall sink further into an unpredictably disastrous abyss.

183. In conclusion, I will repeat something our President, Fidel Castro, said from this rostrum at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly: ". . . unequal exchange is ruining and impoverishing our peoples and must cease. Inflation, which is being exported to us, is impoverishing our peoples and must cease. Protectionism impoverishes our peoples and must cease." [*31st meeting, paras. 86-88.*]

184. Mr. XIE Qimei (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): We meet here today to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which is an event of significance. The Chinese delegation sincerely hopes that this meeting will have positive effects and contribute to the promotion of the North-South negotiations and the strengthening of international economic co-operation.

185. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted by the General Assembly 10 years ago, is an important document. This document, together with the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, sets forth the basic principles for the establishment of a new international economic order and points to the orientation of the democratization and rationalization of world economic growth and social development for a fairly long period. The charter provides that every State has the right freely to choose its economic system and freely to exercise full permanent sovereignty over its natural resources and economic activities, and also establishes the right of developing countries to participate on a basis of equality in international economic relations. Based on the fact that developing countries are in a disadvantageous position in the existing international economic system as a result of the long years of colonialist rule they were subjected to, the charter lays down a number of more just and equitable principles to guide international economic co-operation. They include the granting of preferential treatment to developing countries, stabilization of their export earnings, the right of every State to benefit from the advances in science and technology and the need to give developing countries development assistance. These principles are aimed at restructuring the world economy and establishing a new system of international economic relations so as to facilitate the acceleration of the economic development of the developing countries and seek to bridge the economic gap between themselves and the developed countries, in the interest of promoting the common prosperity of all countries. All this is conducive to the maintenance of world peace and stability and conforms to the interests of the peoples of all countries. The principles I have mentioned will therefore remain valid for a considerably long period of time.

186. As we commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the charter today, we cannot but point out with regret that the charter remains largely unimplemented and that the economic development of the developing countries still faces a most unfavourable external environment.

187. Primary products, the main source of export earnings for the developing countries, are seriously affected by the violent fluctuations in the international commodity market and their terms of trade are deteriorating. The principles and rules for the multilateral trade system have been grossly violated, and protectionist measures are multiplying. The generalized preferential system has not been fully implemented owing to the many restrictive measures imposed on the variety and quantity of commodities.

188. The developing countries call for a more just and effective international division of labour, so as to change the structure of world production and speed up their industrialization. However, for many years the negotiations on protectionism and structural adjustment have produced no concrete results, and the formulation of a code of conduct on transnational corporations and an international code of conduct on the transfer of technology have long remained unfulfilled; consequently, the process of industrialization in the developing countries has been very slow, and to this day, their share of world industrial production has been small. Should this be allowed to continue for long, the prospect of reaching the Lima target will remain dim.

189. With regard to development funds, public assistance for development has stagnated since the beginning of the 1980s, being less than half of the international target of 0.7 per cent. Moreover, there is a tendency to stress the bilateral approach while reducing multilateral assistance. The capital of the international monetary institutions has become even less commensurate with the needs, while the terms for obtaining credits and loans from those institutions have become increasingly harsh. Loans from international private banks have been drastically retrenched and the interest rates on bank loans are very high. As a result, developing countries have run into a serious shortage of development funds. The factors I have mentioned, combined with the reduction of export earnings, an increase in real interest rates and the over-valuation of some key currencies, have resulted in a sharp rise in the foreign debts of developing countries, going up from about $US 160 billion 10 years ago to over $US 800 billion today. By 1983, interest payments outflows of the developing countries were already more than the net inflow of credit.

190. In short, the charter has largely been unimplemented in the past 10 years, and irrational and unjust international economic relations remain basically unchanged. Especially the recent economic crisis has further weakened the position of many developing countries in the world economy, thus making the structural imbalances in the world economy even more prominent. The economic growth of these countries has been stagnant, and the gap between the

rich and the poor countries is widening. This cannot but cause grave concern to the international community. At the current session of the General Assembly, many countries have stated the basic reasons for the lack of progress in the implementation of the charter and the measures that should be taken. Here we also wish to offer our observations and suggestions.

191. It is true that there are domestic causes for the serious economic difficulties in the developing countries. However, to a great extent those difficulties are the result of the structural malfunctioning in the world economy. International economic relations must be transformed along the lines pointed out by the charter and the basic documents on the establishment of a new international economic order. Should we fail to take reform measures to remove those malfunctions, developing countries will face long years of low growth rates or stagnation and fall into an ever-deepening whirlpool of indebtedness, or even a crisis of survival. That will make it hard for the world economy to regain vitality.

192. The launching of global negotiations is, after all, an important instrument worth trying by the international community in the course of establishing the new international economic order. We hope that the few major developed countries that still take a negative attitude towards this will reconsider their positions. At the same time, we believe that the international community should not rest content with merely issuing declarations of principles, nor should it wait passively. Instead, it should promptly adopt a set of comprehensive, interrelated, practical and effective measures designed genuinely to help the developing countries solve their pressing problems and regain their development momentum.

193. The United Nations provides an excellent venue for North-South dialogue and multilateral economic co-operation. In recent years the role of the Organization has been somewhat weakened, which is not beneficial to the implementation of the charter. We hope that one major developed country will change its present position and contribute to strengthening the competence of the United Nations in making and implementing decisions in the economic field.

194. The People's Republic of China has made and will continue to make efforts for the implementation of the charter. China is a socialist developing country which pursues the principle of "maintaining the leading role of the planned economy supplemented by market regulation" and the policy of "opening to the outside world". It has established trade relations with 174 countries and regions on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, and it actively promotes its economic co-operation with other developing countries. By the end of 1983, China had helped 76 developing countries build over 1,300 projects and had dispatched over 180,000 engineers and technicians to those countries.

195. China respects the sovereignty of the recipient countries, attaches no political strings to its aid, offers them low-interest or interest-free loans and transfers to them those technologies that are suited to their domestic conditions with a view to helping them to promote their national economies. China has consistently taken a positive approach towards the North-South dialogue and stood for the promotion of economic co-operation between the developing and the developed countries on the basis of continuous transformation of the unjust and inequitable international economic relations. We are ready to join all other countries, particularly developing countries, in making unremitting endeavours for the implementation of the charter, the establishment of the new international economic order and the revitalization of the world economy.

196. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): Ten years have passed since the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. It is a relatively short period, but a sufficient one to prove that the validity and importance of the charter have only increased with the passage of time. This document is among the achievements of the United Nations, marking the most brilliant pages of its history. It is a vision of the world for which we are all striving.

197. Although the charter deals with economic rights and duties of States, it necessarily and rightly involves principles and a wider scope of international relations. All segments of international relations are today mutually intertwined and interdependent. Only joint action can enhance and accelerate progress in the world. It is often quite difficult to point out the individual achievements of economic, social and other measures and actions taken in order to promote international relations in general and in some spheres, including the economic sphere, in particular.

198. In the preamble to the charter, the General Assembly states that its fundamental purpose is to promote the establishment of the new international economic order, based on equity, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest and co-operation among all States, irrespective of their economic and social systems.

199. In order to reach this goal, action cannot be confined to efforts in the economic sphere. Therefore the charter proceeds from a set of principles which regulate, as explicitly stated in the charter, "economic as well as political and other relations among States". The principle of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States is rightly placed at the top of the list. It is followed by others, including the principle of international co-operation for development, which is found in numerous other United Nations documents, and first of all, explicitly or implicitly, in the Charter of the United Nations.

200. In the context of economic rights and duties, these principles have a particular purpose and meaning, since they express the entire complexity of the conditions to be fulfilled in order to achieve substantial economic and social progress in the world.

201. Like any other document of a similar nature, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States is future-oriented. It contains far-reaching and progressive aspirations in the most important fields of international relations. On the other hand, it perhaps overlooks some realities of the world we live in. Although it did not receive universal support, we nevertheless keep returning to it, as on this occasion, in order to be inspired by it and to continue to act in its spirit with greater resolve.

202. This is more necessary today than ever, since there is a dangerous exacerbation of relations in the world, with acute crises, conflicts and disputes, with a critical situation in the world economy, particularly in the developing countries, and with a dramatic situation on the continent of Africa.

203. It is our desire that this occasion will serve as a contribution to greater awareness of the need to overcome those negative trends by proceeding to constructive negotiations within the United Nations framework and by implementing its decisions, in which the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States has a prominent place.

204. All creative and significant initiatives emerge at times when circumstances demand them and when there exist subjective forces able to express them and sooner or later to carry them out and translate them into practice. The charter whose tenth anniversary we are observing is yet another confirmation of that simple but historic truth.

205. All this does not lessen but, on the contrary, emphasizes the far-sightedness and statesmanship of Mr. Luis Echeverría, who, as President of Mexico, initiated and elaborated the concept of the charter. The non-aligned and other developing countries remain its natural source and stronghold. The charter, however, also enjoys the support of some developed countries, which we hope will be greater in the future, since what is involved here is the common interests of the entire international community.

206. Mr. PÉREZ GUERRERO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States is an event of great importance for the international community and for the United Nations which represents it.

207. This charter originated on the initiative of the President of Mexico, at the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held in Santiago in 1972. It was my privilege to invite President Echeverría to take the Chair at that Conference. That happy and daring initiative was broadly supported, and the relevant resolution was adopted with certain reservations on the part of a few countries, as tends to be the case when a forward-looking position is called for in the United Nations, as in these years of transition towards a new, more just and equitable international economic order.

208. Following the arduous work carried out at UNCTAD, the adoption of the charter by the General Assembly constituted a very important contribution to bringing order to economic relations, which already were showing signs of great instability and were becoming the focus of deep concern.

209. Ten years later, we find ourselves in a situation of great difficulty and suffering for most of mankind which those in some circles try to hide. However, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States remains an undeniable contribution to the new international economic order. It is an instrument which must survive all these vicissitudes. It is part of international law, and this position can only be consolidated with the progressive forward movement—which has now been practically halted—towards a new international economic order, thus leaving behind for ever the present injustices which afflict us.

210. The international community cannot allow a world that is already adrift to continue to be subjected to developments resulting from the collapse of an anachronistic order of things. We must ensure, from both the global and the sectoral points of view, that when the most economically powerful countries realize that this is in their interest as well as in that of all the other countries, the United Nations is able, without any further vacillation or hesitation but also without undue haste, to take the positive path indicated by our common needs and interests.

211. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States is of great assistance to us in undertaking this difficult but indispensable task.

212. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation fully agrees with the statement made at the present meeting by the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on behalf of the socialist countries concerned.

213. We, in turn, wish to make a few additional points.

214. Throughout its existence, the Soviet State has tirelessly pursued a foreign policy designed to bring about, in the words of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, "international relations making it possible for all oppressed nationalities to throw off the imperialist yoke".

215. The adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was an important stage in the struggle of the progressive forces of the world to improve and democratize international economic relations. It became possible as a result of the consistent, joint efforts of the socialist and developing States to break with the old order and establish a new, just international economic order.

216. The first few years of the charter's existence coincided with the process of international détente, and there were favourable prospects for its successful implementation. However, the policy adopted by the imperialist forces, particularly the United States, in the late seventies and early eighties, of winding down détente and stepping up the arms race, of seeking military supremacy and imposing their systems on other peoples, broke off this process of improving international conditions and did substantial harm to the emerging structure of mutually advantageous economic relations among States with different social and economic systems. As a result, progress in the implementation of the purposes of the charter has been insignificant.

217. In recent years, the imperialist Powers have increasingly been grossly violating the basic principles of international political and economic relations, by pursuing a policy of blackmail, diktat and so-called economic sanctions. It is the fault of imperialism that political tension has spread to international economic relations, causing very dire consequences for the prospects of the democratization of world economic relations. Certain developing countries are being increasingly involved by aggressive Western circles in the recent spiral in the arms race that has been imposed by those circles, and this has had a negative impact on the state of international economic relations.

218. The Soviet Union has always stressed the basic importance of the intrinsic link between development and disarmament for the successful process of the improvement of international economic relations. In the letter on this question addressed to the Secretary-General on 18 May 1984, Mr. A. A. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, stresses:

> "The growth of the arms race leads to an intensification of the distortion and instability of international economic relations and worsens the prospects for restructuring them on just and democratic principles and creating a new international

economic order free from exploitation and diktat".[11]

219. The Soviet Union, which has consistently put forward important disarmament initiatives, seeks the adoption of realistic measures to curb the arms race. That would enable us to increase significantly the resources allocated to development, including that of the developing countries.

220. The developing countries, whose economic problems are a direct consequence of the colonial and neo-colonial policies of the imperialist States, continue to suffer the dire consequences of the crisis in the capitalist economy today. The debt problem may become irreversible because of the colossal drain of financial resources from the developing countries through the channels of the transnational corporations to the developed countries. As a result of this phenomenon, the net losses of the developing countries in foreign currency from 1980 to 1982 alone were, according to the Group of 77, about $200 billion.

221. The situation has been further compounded by the fact that the Western States have disregarded such provisions of the charter as equal participation by all States in the international decision-making process in the solution of world economic, financial and monetary problems, promotion of the transfer of high technology to the developing countries, and the granting of assistance to developing countries free of any conditions derogating from their sovereignty—provisions in articles 10, 13 and 17 of the charter.

222. On the whole, in recent years we have witnessed a clear hardening by the major Western countries of the political and economic conditions not only in regard to development assistance but also in regard to virtually all areas of economic relations.

223. Capitalizing on the serious economic situation of young States, the imperialist circles are bent on forcing the developing countries to renounce the support given by United Nations bodies to the progressive demands of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77 for the restructuring of international economic relations. Because of the position of the Western countries, all the basic economic initiatives of the developing countries have been blocked.

224. In contrast to this obstructionist policy of the imperialist Powers, the Soviet Union and the other socialist States have always given and will continue to give political support to the developing countries in their efforts to achieve economic independence and the democratization of international economic relations. It is precisely thanks to that support that in recent years the United Nations has been able to adopt important resolutions for the development of the progressive provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. I am referring in particular to such resolutions adopted at the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions of the General Assembly as those on "Economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries" and "Confidence-building in international economic relations".

225. In the Declaration of the high-level Economic Conference of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, held in Moscow from 12 to 14 June 1984, it is stated that:

> "In international economic relations, there is a vital need for mutually advantageous and equal co-operation among all countries. Without that, there can be no sound material basis for consolidating and expanding détente." [*See A/39/323, annex II.*]

226. The Soviet Union actively and consistently supports the proposal of the developing countries to hold in the United Nations a round of global negotiations, in keeping with General Assembly resolution 34/138, which is being sabotaged by the West.

227. A significant contribution by the USSR in implementing the goals of the charter is the consistent policy to have an all-round development of trade, economic, scientific and technological co-operation with the developing countries. In our country, that policy has been institutionalized as State policy and is a new type of international economic relations. Specific facts relating to the magnitude and form of our economic assistance to the developing countries are well known. In this area, the USSR continues to do more than any developed capitalist country.

228. The Soviet Union will continue decisively to seek to implement the progressive decisions taken by the United Nations in the area of restructuring international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, in particular on the provisions and principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

229. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): Ten years ago today, the General Assembly, with tremendous prescience, adopted the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States on the initiative of the Government of Mexico. The intention of the charter then, and now, is to enhance the legal and binding character of international economic relations, removing economic co-operation from the realm of good will and grounding it in the law by transferring consecrated principles of solidarity among men to the sphere of relations among nations.

230. It is a tribute to the tremendous foresight of the Assembly that the objectives of the charter, namely, to promote the establishment of the new international economic order based on equity, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest and co-operation among all States, particularly in the economic field, have remained as valid today as when they were first enunciated some 10 years ago. Another clarion call in that document is for a just and equitable economic and social order through structural changes in the world economy and other measures that take into account the specific needs of developing countries.

231. Commemorating the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States provides us with an opportunity to determine how many of its objectives, if any, have been achieved, and if the answer is negative, to work out new strategies to ensure its implementation.

232. In taking stock, it is of concern and regret to the Sierra Leone delegation that 10 years after the adoption of the charter, its economic, social and political goals have remained largely unfulfilled. Today, the economic climate for many of our countries is even bleaker than when this instrument was adopted 10 years ago. The failure of the international community to rise to the challenges and opportunities of the charter is partly responsible for the present dire economic consequences that now afflict most of our countries and threaten our very survival.

233. Today, the stark economic reality of the African condition is that millions of people are afflicted by hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy and abject poverty. Over the last few years, the economies of African countries have suffered severe declines in growth and output of goods and services. This trend, already apparent in the 1970s, has worsened over the last three years, leading to depressing growth rates or total stagnation. The result is a dangerous fall in already precarious living standards, mass starvation and widespread decay of the small but vital infrastructure and even the environment.

234. The reasons for this decline are many and varied. Foremost among them are the recent severe world recession which has had such a damaging effect on the economies and productive capacity of many African countries, and the stubborn refusal of our trading partners to pay fair, remunerative prices for our commodities and raw materials, as called for in the charter. Furthermore, the international trading system still requires developing countries to negotiate the prices they receive for their major raw materials and commodities, while they must pay the ever-increasing prices that are set by the manufacturers using those same raw materials and commodities. It is thus inevitable that the weakest members of the system are driven into bankruptcy.

235. For Africa, these various factors have been further aggravated by the most severe drought the continent has suffered in this century, resulting in a catastrophic fall in food production and the consequent loss of human lives through famine and starvation.

236. The acute debt problem of third-world countries, particularly those in Latin America, has preoccupied the international community over the last two years. The harsh conditions attaching to those debts are today hampering economic recovery and development in many of the affected countries.

237. Given the magnitude and severity of the problems that I have just been describing, it is clear that the African people cannot on their own prevent the imminent economic collapse that threatens many of their impoverished nations, nor can they, on their own, implement the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. While we recognize that our Governments must continue to bear responsibility for our own well-being, on the other hand, we expect the international community, in a spirit of solidarity and in a reaffirmation of our mutual interdependence, to help to avert the catastrophe that now threatens the African continent.

238. Specifically, the international community has to come to grips with the continuing adverse terms of trade which now plague the economies of much of the third world in general. In this connection, the reform of existing financial institutions, the reduction in the present crippling rates of interest and the liberalization of world trade—as demanded in the charter—must be considered imperative.

239. Furthermore, it is the view of the Sierra Leone delegation that in seeking solutions to the manifold problems now facing the African continent, intensification of economic co-operation within the multilateral and specialized institutions, especially the World Bank, FAO and UNDP, cannot be overemphasized. Those institutions must be given increased financial support and provided with the necessary resources to enable them to perform their tasks more effectively.

240. The aspiration of the charter to solve the real economic problems facing the developing countries today and the attainment of a just and equitable distribution of resources make the charter more timely and relevant than ever before.

241. Until we can begin to solve some of the economic problems facing the developing countries today, the impact of this document will remain limited, much against the will of the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community.

242. What is required, therefore, is a bold, imaginative and generous response to implement the provisions of the charter so that together we can find a lasting solution to our manifold economic problems.

243. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The position of the German Democratic Republic on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and its implementation has already been expressed in the joint statement of socialist countries which was just presented by the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Vladimir A. Kravets. I would like to refer to that statement and affirm that this Magna Charta of international economic relations, which was adopted 10 years ago, remains as topical as ever and is fully valid. It is one of the fundamental documents of international economic relations which, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, defines the basic criteria, tasks and guidelines for United Nations activities in the politico-economic field. In this connection, we would like to pay tribute to the initiative and constructive activities of Mexico, which were highly conducive to bringing about the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

244. The active share of the German Democratic Republic in the elaboration and in the adoption by an overwhelming majority of General Assembly resolution 3281 (XXIX), together with the adoption at the sixth special session of the Assembly of the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order [*resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI)*], was one of the first steps the socialist German State took within the framework of the United Nations in the politico-economic field.

245. Pursuant to its policy directed towards the safeguarding of peace and towards social progress, the German Democratic Republic has made all possible efforts to translate the charter into the practice of international economic relations. Full equality, respect for sovereignty, non-discrimination, mutual benefit and non-interference in internal affairs—these are the principles marking the relations of the German Democratic Republic with States having different social systems, not least developing countries. A constituent part of this policy is the solidarity and support rendered by the German Democratic Republic to those countries in their just struggle for economic independence and social progress.

246. The adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States took place at the time of the process of international détente, which also made possible a number of other important initiatives in the politico-economic field within the framework of the United Nations.

247. At the same time, the last decade has shown that a long distance remains to be covered from the adoption of progressive international instruments to their full implementation, with major obstacles having to be overcome on the way. The imperialist course of confrontation and arms build-up undermines the realization of the principles set forth in the charter. The artificial obstacles in international economic relations ensuing from such a policy, the threat or use of economic boycott, embargo and economic aggression, as well as other internationally illegal measures, run counter to the purpose of the charter. They must be excluded as a means of politics. What is equally needed is measures of confidence-building in international relations, including international economic relations. Such steps are as indispensable as are effective measures to halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field.

248. It is these aspects underlying the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States that guided the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty at its meeting held at Berlin on 3 and 4 December 1984. The Communiqué on the meeting [*A/39/763, annex*] recalls the proposals which the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty have submitted to the United Nations since the Prague Political Declaration of 5 January 1983[6] to evolve and strengthen a policy of disarmament, safeguard peace and ensure equal and peaceful international co-operation. Among them are the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty States aimed at establishing a new international economic order and directed against the policy of interference in the internal affairs of States and all actions designed to undermine the socio-political systems in other States. The Ministers further stressed that the application of discriminatory restrictions in economic relations and any other kind of pressure contradict the basic principles of State-to-State relations.

249. It may be by chance that the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty coincide. But it is not by chance that the contents of the meeting's Communiqué, the latest document of socialist States, and those of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States are largely identical in terms of their tasks and objectives, not least because both documents are inspired by the desire to make an effective contribution to the peaceful co-existence between States having different social systems.

250. We are under no illusion that the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the struggle for equal and mutually advantageous international economic relations will not meet with strong resistance in the future also. The experience of the past 10 years has confirmed that progress on the road to normalizing and restructuring international economic relations can be achieved only by joint action between all anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces in the world. The activities of the United Nations in the politico-economic field over the past decade have proved that there is no reasonable alternative to the peaceful, mutually advantageous and equal co-operation of States in solving the great and complex tasks mankind is facing today.

251. The tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States should and must induce all sides concerned to redouble their efforts towards giving effect to the progressive principles and norms of international economic relations embodied in that document.

252. The German Democratic Republic, as in the past, remains ready and willing to make its contribution to that end.

253. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States is thus concluded.

The meeting rose at 2.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] TD/IPC/CF/CONF/24.

[2] See A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, chap. III, paras. 35-39 and para. 42, E.

[3] *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, Paris, 1-14 September 1981* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.I.8), part one, sect. A.

[4] A/S-11/14, annex I.

[5] A/CN.10/64.

[6] *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1983*, document S/15556, annex.

[7] A/38/537, annex I.

[8] Subsequently adopted as resolution 39/163.

[9] See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Third Session*, vol. I, *Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.II.D.4), annex VIII F.

[10] *Ibid., Second Session*, vol. I and Corr.1 and 3 and Add.1 and 2, *Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.II.D.14), p. 431.

[11] See A/CN.10/57/Add.10.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

97th PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 12 December 1984,
at 3.55 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (*concluded*):*

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(*c*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded on 4 December. In this connection, the Assembly has before it, in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24, part four, chap. I*], five draft resolutions recommended by the Council, and a series of amendments to those draft resolutions, contained in documents A/39/L.23 to A/39/L.25.

2. I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to introduce the draft resolutions.

3. I call upon the representative of Zambia, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa".

4. Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): The cause of Namibia's independence has been supported by the overwhelming majority of States since the early years of the Organization. Since then, the momentum has been kept up by the termination of the Mandate 18 years ago; by the historic advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971;[1] and by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and many other resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

5. Over the years, the international community has, however, been frustrated in its efforts to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia by the intransigence of the Pretoria régime, backed by its allies, which has created impasse after impasse, all of them familiar to those assembled here.

6. The racist régime has tried all kinds of manoeuvres to hoodwink the international community. I refer here to attempts by South Africa and the United States to link the question of Namibian independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

7. The Security Council has only recently rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, including General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. By its resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council decided that, in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa, it would consider the adoption of appropriate measures.

8. South Africa's intransigence remains the major hurdle in the way of Namibian independence. It is in this context that the draft resolution that my delegation has the honour to introduce is to be seen. It is a draft resolution that has been recommended by consensus to the Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

9. The draft resolution begins by reaffirming once more the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia, while reaffirming the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for that territory until independence. The draft resolution further reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people by all means, including armed struggle, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], their sole and authentic representative.

10. After laying down these basic principles reiterated year after year by the Assembly, the draft resolution proceeds to condemn South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and for obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which remain the only basis for the internationally recognized peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

11. The draft resolution firmly rejects the persistent attempts by the United States and South Africa to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and, in particular, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, and emphasizes unequivocally that any such attempts are designed to delay the decolonization process in Namibia and constitute interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

12. In view of the recent South African threats to proceed with yet another so-called internal solution in Namibia, such as the establishment of yet another puppet institution in the form of the so-called Multi-Party Conference, the draft resolution strongly condemns this latest direct violation of Security Council resolution 439 (1978), aimed at perpetuating its domination of the Territory.

---

*Resumed from the 84th meeting.

13. The draft resolution condemns the recent imposition of military conscription of all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 into the occupying colonial army in yet another sinister attempt by the illegal occupation régime to suppress the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people and to force them to kill one another. In this regard, the draft resolution declares that South Africa's attempts to enforce military conscription in Namibia are illegal, null and void.

14. The draft resolution also denounces the establishment of the so-called Liaison Office of the United States Government in Windhoek in direct violation of relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular Security Council resolutions 283 (1970) and 301 (1971), and in total disregard of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice,[1] and calls for its immediate closure and withdrawal.

15. The draft resolution urges the United Nations Council for Namibia, in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, to consider the promulgation of additional decrees and other legislation in order to protect and promote the interests of the people of Namibia and effectively implement such legislation.

16. The draft resolution welcomes the release of the patriot Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, and of other leaders of that organization and considers it a victory for the international campaign.

17. The draft resolution condemns the increased assistance rendered by the major Western countries and Israel to South Africa in the political, economic, financial and military fields.

18. The draft resolution condemns South Africa for its military buildup in Namibia and its use of Namibian territory to launch armed attacks against independent African States of the region, particularly its continued unprovoked attacks against and occupation of Angola. Furthermore, it expresses grave concern at the acquisition of nuclear weapons capability by the Pretoria régime as constituting a further attempt on its part to terrorize the independent States of the region while also posing a danger to international peace and security. In this regard, the draft resolution condemns the continuing military and nuclear collaboration of certain Western countries and Israel with the racist régime, which is in violation of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa under Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

19. The draft resolution also deals with South Africa's attempts to thwart the work of the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference and it calls upon all States and the United Nations agencies to render all possible assistance to the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference in its efforts to promote regional economic co-operation. The draft resolution declares that all activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia are illegal under international law and that all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia are liable to pay damages to the future lawful Government of Namibia and calls upon the Governments concerned to take appropriate measures to ensure the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[2]

20. The draft resolution reiterates its request to all States, pending the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, to take legislative, administrative and other measures, unilaterally and collectively, to isolate South Africa and requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa.

21. Finally, the draft resolution calls upon the Security Council to adopt the necessary measures to tighten the arms embargo against South Africa and ensure strict compliance by all States and, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security, urges the Security Council immediately to impose on South Africa comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

22. It is my sincere hope that this draft resolution will receive the full support of the Assembly.

23. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Guyana, who wishes to introduce draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

24. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution B, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—a resolution which is so well known to members of the Assembly that it hardly requires any introduction or description.

25. Representatives will recall that it was little more than one year ago—in October 1983—that the Security Council addressed itself to the question of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). On that occasion it adopted resolution 539 (1983), in which it once again expressed its indignation at South Africa's refusal to comply with its resolutions, in particular at the racist régime's insistence on an irrelevant and extraneous issue of "linkage", which obstructed the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Council also reiterated that resolution 435 (1978) was the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

26. The General Assembly, for its part, made a similar determination in its resolution 38/36 B, and demanded the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without qualification, modification or amendment or the introduction of extraneous and irrelevant issues of "linkage", "parallelism" or "reciprocity" insisted upon by the United States of America and South Africa.

27. South Africa's intransigence, along with the support extended to it by its collaborators, remains the only hurdle in the way of Namibian independence.

28. The draft resolution which my delegation has the honour to introduce to this Assembly is succinct and to the point. After reaffirming the need to proceed without any further delay with the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and after taking note of the consultations which have been held with a view to achieving the early implementation of the plan, it strongly condemns South Africa for obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978), 439 (1978), 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) and for its manoeuvres, in contravention of those resolutions, designed to consolidate its colonial and neo-colonial interests at the expense of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to genuine self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

29. It proceeds to reaffirm that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until independence and reiterates that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. In paragraph 8, it formally rejects the persistent attempts by the United States of America and South Africa to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

30. The draft resolution strongly condemns racist South Africa for sabotaging the Namibian independence talks held in 1984 at Lusaka and Mindelo by insisting on the notorious "linkage" pre-condition and introducing new insidious subterfuge as alternatives to resolution 435 (1978).

31. The draft resolution requests the Security Council to exercise its authority with regard to the implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978), 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) so as to bring about the independence of Namibia without further delay, and to act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the South African administration in Namibia aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people for independence. In this connection, the draft resolution urges the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to ensure the total cessation of all co-operation with that régime, particularly in the military and nuclear fields, by Governments, corporations, institutions and individuals.

32. The concern of draft resolution B is purely and simply the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and nothing else. It is the implementation of what is the only internationally accepted framework for a settlement of the Namibian question, a framework unanimously adopted by the Security Council in discharge of its solemn obligation. For, so long as resolution 435 (1978) continues to be unimplemented, the suffering of the people of Namibia continues. As we consider this draft resolution, let us keep uppermost in our minds the well-being, the interests and the future of the people of Namibia and, accordingly, give this draft resolution our whole-hearted support.

33. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia, who will introduce draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".

34. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): I have the honour to introduce, for the consideration and adoption of the Assembly, draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".

35. The United Nations Council for Namibia was established by a General Assembly resolution as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence and as the policy-making organ of the Assembly on the question of Namibia. We in the United Nations Council for Namibia consider that the proposed programme of work of the Council for the next year will contribute to the effective and fruitful fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

36. The programme envisages that the Council will continue to represent Namibia and protect the interests of the people of Namibia in the international arena, including conferences, intergovernmental organizations and meetings of the specialized agencies and of non-governmental organizations. It will also continue to consult with Governments and seek their support for efforts of the United Nations designed to bring about a settlement of the question of Namibia.

37. The Council will also contact Governments and corporations in order to persuade them to cease any dealings with South Africa regarding Namibia and, particularly, to stop the exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia. It will consider the activities of foreign economic interests operating in the Territory of Namibia with a view to recommending appropriate policies to the United Nations General Assembly.

38. During 1985, the Council will take further steps to implement Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[2] which it enacted on 27 September 1974. In this regard, the Council will consider legal action in the domestic courts of States and other appropriate bodies.

39. The Council will also continue to review and report on the progress of the liberation struggle in Namibia and to monitor the voluntary boycott of South Africa. It will, for these purposes, continue to gather information from governmental and non-governmental sources and to prepare comprehensive reports on developments concerning Namibia. It will hold a series of plenary meetings and continue to carry out hearings, seminars and regional symposia to obtain information and mobilize international action in support of the cause of the independence of Namibia.

40. In implementing its programme of work, as well as in any matter of interest to the Namibian people, the Council will continue its close co-operation and consultation with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. It will also continue to co-operate with the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and with the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] on the question of Namibia.

41. The Council will undertake its programme of work with the intention of effectively increasing and intensifying international support for the speedy withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia and for the immediate independence of Namibia.

42. The Council is convinced that its activities for the next year will contribute to keeping the question of Namibia at the forefront of international attention and concern and that they will be instrumental in translating into concerted action the support of the international community for the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

43. We feel in the Council that at this moment, when South Africa is rejecting all attempts to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia, the programme of work of the Council has become even more important and essential. Therefore, we are submitting draft resolution C to the General Assembly for its adoption, convinced that the activities of the Council will significantly contribute to the early attainment of independence for Namibia.

44. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Bulgaria to introduce draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia".

45. Mr. YOSSIPHOV (Bulgaria): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution D entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia".

46. The formulation of the draft resolution has been motivated, as indicated in the preamble, by the urgent need to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia in the achievement of self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and, in particular, to intensify world-wide and continuous dissemination of information on the struggle for liberation being waged by the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

47. In pursuance of that goal, the United Nations Council for Namibia is requested to consider ways and means of increasing the dissemination of information relating to Namibia. The Secretary-General is requested to ensure that the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, in all its activities of dissemination of information on the question of Namibia, follows the policy guidelines laid down by the United Nations Council for Namibia and assists, as a matter of priority, the Council in the implementation of its programme of dissemination of information.

48. Over the years, it has become increasingly clear that the mere recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence, the repeated condemnations of racist South Africa's brutal colonialist policy of *apartheid*, repression and aggression, the appeals by the world Organization for the immediate cessation of that policy and for granting independence to Namibia, although being of utmost significance, cannot by themselves bring about the withdrawal of Pretoria from the illegally occupied Territory. On the contrary, in blatant defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions, the racists have continued and expanded their aggressive colonial war against the people of Namibia, who, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, are waging a heroic and just struggle for independence. The aggression of Pretoria long ago crossed the borders of South Africa and Namibia.

49. Therefore, draft resolution D contains, in paragraph 5, a decision to intensify the Council's international campaign "in support of the cause of Namibia and to expose and denounce the collusion of the United States of America, certain other Western countries and Israel with the South African racists", and to this end the Council is requested to formulate a programme of activities on the dissemination of information, including the organization of an international conference at United Nations Headquarters in order to mobilize and strengthen further international support for the just cause and heroic struggle of the Namibian people, led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO.

50. In recognition of the very important role that non-governmental organizations have to play in our common struggle for the liberation of Namibia, the draft resolution would further strengthen their co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and urge them to intensify their efforts for the mobilization of public support and solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people.

51. In addition, the draft resolution contains other provisions aimed at strengthening the co-operation of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat with the United Nations Council for Namibia, and also requests the Council to continue to organize journalists' encounters prior to the activities of the Council during 1985. Member States are requested to broadcast programmes and publish material about the situation in and around Namibia and the obligation of Governments and peoples to assist in the struggle of Namibia for independence.

52. The dissemination of information on Namibia represents a very important aspect of the overall efforts of the United Nations to achieve freedom and independence for Namibia. In spite of the long years of illegal occupation of Namibia, the public in some countries is still not sufficiently aware of the true nature of the problem. The media of certain countries either do not publicize sufficient information on the problem of Namibia or publicized information is biased in accordance with specific political interests.

53. The Council also expresses grave concern at the increasing South African media propaganda and "psychological warfare" on independent African countries and SWAPO. The Council also deplores the deliberate abuse of the mass information media in some countries for the purpose of waging that same "psychological warfare" under the guise of the concept of "free flow of information, ideas and people". That concept has been misused to brand as terrorists the fighters for national independence in Namibia while condoning genuine acts of terrorism.

54. To render assistance and to bring human dignity to the oppressed peoples of Namibia, the United Nations must increase its support to the media organs, especially those of independent African countries, for the purpose of nullifying the adverse effects of Pretoria's destabilization campaign.

55. Therefore, dissemination of information is an important activity and it is a most important means for bringing pressure to bear on Pretoria and its allies for their compliance with the will of the Namibian people and the resolutions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to Namibia without further delay.

56. I therefore have the honour and pleasure of recommending draft resolution D to the General Assembly for adoption.

57. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Venezuela, who will introduce draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

58. Mr. GRIFFIN (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

59. The United Nations Fund for Namibia was established in 1970 [*resolution 2679 (XXV)*] on the termination of South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory, and the United Nations thus assumed direct responsibility for Namibia until its accession to independence. The United Nations entered into the solemn obligation to help the Namibian people in its struggle to achieve independence, and therefore the United Nations should provide the people of Namibia with the material assistance it requires until independence.

60. At the outset, the sphere of activities and assistance provided in the context of the United Nations Fund for Namibia was restricted, but when

the struggle for liberation was stepped up the need for assistance increased and at the end of the 1970s, the Fund was composed of three accounts: the General Account, which provided educational and social assistance and relief aid to Namibians; the Nationhood Programme Account, which provided assistance for comprehensive development programmes, including those that would be carried out during the period just prior to independence and those that would be carried out after it; and the United Nations Institute for Namibia Account which provides financial resources for training functions and research functions in the United Nations Institute for Namibia in Lusaka, Zambia.

61. Therefore, the magnitude and the variety of the assistance provided under the United Nations Fund for Namibia has grown as the years have passed.

62. I have pleasure in reporting to the Assembly that the activities financed by the Fund are proceeding satisfactorily and all the available funds in the three accounts have been allocated. However, the Namibian people's need for material assistance considerably exceeds financial resources available, therefore several proposed projects have not been implemented, and requests from Namibians who are candidates for scholarships have had to be rejected because of the scarcity of resources.

63. Note has been taken of the fact that, as in previous years, it is necessary to subsidize the United Nations Fund for Namibia from the regular budget of the United Nations. Therefore, in the draft resolution the Assembly would decide to allocate a sum of $US 1 million for 1985.

64. However, most of the activities carried out within the context of the United Nations Fund for Namibia are financed by voluntary contributions from Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals. I should like to emphasize the urgent need for those donors to increase their contributions to the Fund in order to enable the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to expand its humanitarian and development activities for the Namibians.

65. In this connection, I should like in particular to stress the need for additional contributions to enable the Council to provide assistance to those Namibians who wish to acquire practical experience in the place of work. A growing number of Namibian young people are finishing their theoretical work and also carrying out practical work within the context of various programmes of assistance; but, in order to make a productive and effective contribution to the socio-economic development of Namibia in the period following independence, it is necessary to make it possible for Namibians who have been trained in various disciplines to be accepted in various institutions, particularly in Africa. Therefore, this programme will require additional funds from donor countries as well as job opportunities in host countries. This effort is essential and the United Nations Council for Namibia must make it in order to ensure proper training of Namibians for independence.

66. Draft resolution E refers not only to the direct financing of projects within the context of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, but also to measures necessary to prepare a programme of assistance for Namibian people by carrying out projects which are financed jointly by Governments and non-governmental organizations. In this connection, I draw attention to the fact that effective co-ordination in all areas of assistance is necessary. We must call upon specialized agencies and other institutions of the United Nations system to implement those projects for Namibians rapidly and on the basis of procedures that reflect the role that the United Nations Council for Namibia plays as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia.

67. Increased contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and effective utilization of other available resources, would put the United Nations Council for Namibia in a better situation to alleviate the situation of Namibians who have escaped the repugnant system of *apartheid* and to prepare them for the extremely important task of the reconstruction and administration of their country after it has acceded to independence.

68. Having made this brief introduction, I hope draft resolution E will be adopted unanimously.

69. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United States of America to introduce the amendments contained in A/39/L.23 to L.25.

70. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): As we hope everyone in this chamber is aware, the United States, in co-operation with partners in the contact group and with our colleagues in the front-line States, has been engaged in the effort to bring independence to Namibia through the elimination of the illegal South African occupation of that Territory. Our effort has not slackened. On the contrary, it has intensified markedly of late, as the exchanges between the United States and various parties in southern Africa have mounted in intensity.

71. The United States Government has tried hard to demonstrate at the highest levels our continuing commitment to good relations with Africa and in particular to achieving the independence of Namibia in the shortest possible time, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). President Reagan has underscored the fact that this is a major goal of his Administration. We hope that, with the continued co-operation of our friends and partners in and outside the region, the goal will be achieved. Because of the sensitive nature of our involvement in this effort, we have consistently held the view that it is inappropriate for the United States Government to take a position on the substance of the draft resolutions before us. We shall therefore abstain on these draft resolutions again this year.

72. The citation by name of Member States, and in particular of the United States, in certain sections of those draft resolutions constitutes an unfair and regrettable exception to the long established practices and norms of the United Nations and of the General Assembly. The United Nations was founded to promote peace and greater mutual understanding among nations, despite their differences. It was founded to promote discussion. In pursuit of those goals, it is essential that the Assembly consistently respect basic principles of civility, fairness and factual accuracy. We feel very strongly that direct, hostile, unfair and inaccurate references to particular Member States in United Nations resolutions are contrary to those basic principles and detrimental to our common purposes in the Organization. We have therefore moved to strike out such language from those draft resolutions, as the Fourth Committee did in similar instances. Our amendments received the

support of the majority of the Fourth Committee, and we hope that the important principle involved will receive similar support now.

73. Some delegations have asked us how we can oppose such a phrase as "on account of the veto of the United States of America". Is this, they ask, not simply a statement of fact? It is a fact that the United States exercised its veto on 31 August 1981, as it is a fact that other States have exercised vetoes to defeat Security Council resolutions since then. Yet the names of those States have not been cited in resolutions before this body, despite the fact that blatant and continuing aggression in Afghanistan and Kampuchea were involved. More objectionable still is the argument made in the same paragraph that, as a result of the veto of the United States, armed aggression against Angola continues. That is to say, the draft resolution maintains that the United States is the direct cause of that aggression. That is not true. That assertion is not only demonstrably untrue, it ignores the successful efforts undertaken by the United States to achieve an end to the South African intervention.

74. Another paragraph which similarly ignores these efforts and which we have proposed to delete, denounces the establishment of the United States Liaison Office at Windhoek as a violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Delegations should be aware, however, that the United States Liaison Office was opened as a direct result of the agreements entered into between Angola and South Africa at Lusaka in February of this year. According to the communiqué of that meeting, the parties agreed that a small number of American representatives would participate in the activities of the joint monitoring commission at the request of the parties in order to facilitate the withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola. To this end, and with the agreement of the Governments directly involved, the United States Government opened a small office which had to be near enough to the disengagement process to work effectively with the parties involved. Though located in Windhoek, this office is in no way accredited either to the South African Government or to the authorities in Namibia. It has no diplomatic or consular function; it implies no recognition of the legitimacy of the South African presence in Namibia. Our action is therefore entirely consistent with the resolutions passed by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

75. The issue posed by our proposed amendments is in fact quite a simple one. Does the General Assembly wish to see its resolutions on the serious and urgent matter of Namibia abused for purposes which not only make no contribution to the effort to bring about Namibian independence but which are calculated to discourage those engaged in that effort? Our amendments aim to eliminate just this abuse. We have not proposed to alter in any way the substance of the draft resolutions before us. Therefore, whatever a Government's substantive views may be, whether your Governments wish to support the draft resolutions, abstain or vote against them, you should feel free to support these amendments. We appeal to all, therefore, to join together in reaffirming our respect for the principles of civility, basic fairness and respect for accuracy which have shaped our accepted practices and which should govern all our deliberations and decisions here.

76. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Guyana to speak on a point of order.

77. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): My delegation has asked to speak on a point of order to address itself to the amendments just presented by the delegation of the United States of America to the draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report [*A/39/24, part four, chap. I*]. Those amendments are contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25.

78. It goes without saying that Guyana recognizes and supports the right of the delegation of the United States of America to present those amendments. My delegation has considered them with the same seriousness and thoughtfulness which characterize our approach to any other matter on the agenda of the Assembly.

79. In our approach to the amendments in question, we were of course inspired by our concern for truth, for "factual accuracy", to use the words of the representative of the United States. My delegation believes that the wealth of data available to Members of the Assembly relating to Namibia and to relations of other States with Namibia, quite independently of that prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia itself, fully substantiates the statements advanced in the Council's report, to which objection is being made by the representative of the United States.

80. At any rate, and without in any way wishing to derogate from a position which, in terms of substance, is unassailable, my delegation would like to direct attention to another aspect of this question which we consider to be of equally fundamental importance. It is a commonplace within the United Nations to see the case of Namibia as a unique one in the history and practice of the Organization. The aspects of this uniqueness do not need to be detailed here by me since they were so extensively alluded to in the recently concluded debate on the question of Namibia.

81. The rules of procedure of the General Assembly reveal yet another aspect of the uniqueness of Namibia. Namibia is the only non-independent territory which is the object of specific consideration by those rules of procedure. Delegations will recall that in 1954, at its ninth session, the General Assembly had adopted a special procedure for the examination of reports and petitions relating to Namibia, then the Territory of South West Africa [*resolution 844(IX)*]. That special rule is contained in annex III of the rules of procedure, special rule A. It will be noted that special rule F says:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on questions relating to reports and petitions concerning the Territory of South West Africa shall be regarded as important questions within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations."

Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter reads:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting."

82. Now, if we were to turn to rule 84 of the rules of procedure, we would see set forth the procedure for dealing with amendments to important questions. Rule 84 reads:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on amendments to proposals relating to important questions, and on parts of such proposals put to the vote separately, shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting."

83. It therefore seems clear to my delegation that, in accordance with an unequivocal provision of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia is an important question and that, accordingly, the amendments proposed by the United States of America to the draft resolutions in the report of the Council require for adoption a two-thirds majority of members present and voting. I submit this to the Chair out of a concern for order, for legality, for consistency and for fidelity to the procedures which the Assembly, in its wisdom, had set out three decades ago for dealing with reports relating to Namibia, then South West Africa, and I request that you, Mr. President, guide the Assembly accordingly.

84. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Guyana has drawn attention to special rule F of annex III of the rules of procedure, which reads:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on questions relating to reports and petitions concerning the Territory of South West Africa shall be regarded as important questions within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations."

85. The General Assembly's position regarding the character of decisions concerning Namibia is clearly established. In accordance with rule 84 of the rules of procedure, which reads:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on amendments to proposals relating to important questions, and on parts of such proposals put to the vote separately, shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting",

the amendments proposed to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia are important questions requiring for adoption a two-thirds majority of those Member States present and voting.

86. Accordingly, the Assembly will now proceed to vote on the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25, it being understood that they require for adoption a two-thirds majority of members present and voting. That is the ruling of the President. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

87. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the first amendment in document A/39/L.23, which relates to the seventeenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A, "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela.

There were 55 votes in favour, 65 against and 25 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

88. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the second amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns the twentieth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Gambia, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 57 votes in favour, 63 against and 22 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

89. The PRESIDENT: I next put to the vote the third amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns paragraph 21 of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon,[3] Equatorial Guinea, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 56 votes in favour, 60 against and 29 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

90. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote the fourth amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns paragraph 38 of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Honduras, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 45 votes in favour, 65 against and 32 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

91. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote the fifth and last amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns paragraph 49 of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Botswana, Bulgaria,Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan,[4] Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, India, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 54 votes in favour, 66 against and 23 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was rejected.

92. The PRESIDENT: After some consultations, in order to guide the Assembly, I should like to explain that we have dealt with all the amendments to draft resolution A. We have not yet dealt with the amendments to the other draft resolutions. I think it will be best if we deal with draft resolution A first, and once we have disposed of that and have heard explanations of vote before and after the voting, we can move on to draft resolution B.

93. I call on the representative of Spain, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

94. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With reference to the last vote, I thought that we were voting on paragraph 5 (*a*) in document A/39/L.23, concerning paragraph 49 of draft resolution A. Had my delegation realized that we were voting on paragraphs 5 (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) together, it would have voted in favour. I would ask that these clarifications be included in the verbatim records.

95. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has taken a decision on amendments to draft resolution A only. Some delegations have expressed the wish to explain all their votes before the voting on draft resolution A. Of course, the General Assembly is its own decision-maker, but I suggest that perhaps we could dispose of one draft resolution at a time in order to avoid confusion. Thus, we could hear explanations of vote before the voting on draft resolution A, take the vote on the draft resolution, and then hear those who wish to explain their votes after the voting. Having disposed of draft resolution A, we would then move on to draft resolution B, taking the amendments first and following the same procedure as on draft resolution A.

96. I call on the representative of Somalia on a point of order.

97. Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): My delegation had the impression, with regard to the last amendment that was voted on, the fifth amendment in document A/39/L.23, that paragraphs 5 (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) would be taken separately. Since the three amendments were voted upon together, we would like it to appear in the record of the meeting that had we participated in the voting process we would have voted against.

98. The PRESIDENT: Does the Assembly agree to follow the procedure I have outlined?

99. I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

100. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I understand that you have made a decision. If this is not an arbitrary decision of the President, then I would like to know whether the point you have just mentioned is a part of the rules of procedure, or is it just a choice which can be changed?

101. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly is master of its own decisions. I was merely trying to help the General Assembly. The President cannot dictate to the Assembly. Therefore, I leave it to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to come forward with some bright ideas.

102. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Yesterday, when we were voting on the draft resolutions regarding Palestine [*95th meeting*], we voted on three draft resolutions and then the explanations of vote were given after the voting on all of them. Could we not follow the same procedure today?

103. The PRESIDENT: May I ask the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to make a formal proposal?

104. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I request, Mr. President, that we complete the voting on the amendments in documents A/39/L.24 and L.25 and then give representatives the opportunity to explain their votes.

105. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has formally proposed that we deal with the amendments in documents A/39/L.24 and L.25, and after that hear explanations of vote before the voting. We would then vote on the draft resolutions and hear explanations of vote after the voting. If there is no objection to that procedure, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

106. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed with the vote on the first amendment in document A/39/L.24, which concerns the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Burma, Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,[5] Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 57 votes in favour, 60 against and 30 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

107. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the second amendment in document A/39/L.24, which relates to paragraph 3 of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Gambia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 53 votes in favour, 67 against and 27 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

108. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the third amendment in document A/39/L.24, which concerns paragraph 8 of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 55 votes in favour, 62 against and 30 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

109. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote the fourth and last amendment in document A/39/L.24, which relates to paragraph 9 of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia,[6] Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Egypt, Haiti, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 59 votes in favour, 54 against and 29 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

110. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the first amendment in document A/39/L.25, which relates to the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution D. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Egypt, Gambia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 52 votes in favour, 66 against and 26 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

111. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the second and last amendment in document A/39/L.25, which relates to paragraph 5 of draft resolution D. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 61 votes in favour, 63 against and 21 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

112. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has completed its action on the amendments. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the five draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*A/39/24, part four, chap. I*]. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken.

113. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to make a statement on the draft resolutions on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

114. In their statements in the course of the general debate on the question of Namibia, the Ten stressed their unwavering commitment to the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence by means of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with the United Nations settlement plan, which has been accepted by both South Africa and SWAPO. The Ten have consistently supported efforts aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with the terms of that plan. The Ten do not accept that the settlement plan, endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), should be delayed or set aside for extraneous reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with resolution 435 (1978).

115. The Ten are disappointed that once again draft resolutions on the question of Namibia have

been presented in a way which cannot attract the unanimous support of the Assembly.

116. The attitude of the 10 member States of the European Community to the endorsement of armed struggle in resolutions of the General Assembly has been frequently expressed in the Assembly and is well known. The Ten are conscious that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa suggests to many that it will be ended only through armed struggle. The United Nations, however, has, above all, the obligation to encourage peaceful solutions.

117. The Ten regret that in certain respects the draft resolutions before the Assembly do not appear to take fully into consideration efforts which the Ten have consistently supported—such as those of the Secretary-General—aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

118. The Ten's commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and its division of competences remains unchanged.

119. The people of Namibia have the right to choose their own Government through free and fair elections. In the view of the Ten, none of the participants in these elections should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the people.

120. The Ten reject all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on individual Member States or groups of countries.

121. The Ten wish to reiterate here the concern which they have expressed in the Fifth Committee about the financial implications of some of the resolutions before us. They feel that in the present financial climate a more judicious approach to the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia could have resulted in reduced financial implications without detracting from the attainment of the Council's objectives.

122. The Ten remain firm in their commitment to the independence of Namibia. They will continue to work for and support all efforts aimed at the urgent implementation of the United Nations settlement plan, which alone embodies a universally accepted framework for the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence in a manner which is guaranteed by the Organization to be free and fair.

123. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): During the last few years, the Portuguese delegation has stressed here its opposition to any act likely to delay the process designed to ensure the Namibian people free determination of the political future of their country. Moreover, during the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, my delegation reaffirmed that the situation in southern Africa was all the more deplorable since it increased the feeling of failure, given the obstacles systematically put in the path of the implementation of decisions which reflected a consensus on the creation of a free and independent Namibia and which aimed at putting an end to the violation of the principles on which the Organization is based, in particular those of respect for the rights of peoples to self-determination, to their sovereignty and territorial integrity and to non-interference in their internal affairs.

124. Portugal therefore believes that the immediate accession of Namibia to independence is imperative, with respect for its national frontiers, and considers with apprehension the crisis which has occurred in the United Nations regarding a problem of vital importance which endangers the prestige and credibility of this Organization. In this context, my delegation has also always stressed that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must cease and that the problem falls within the purview of international responsibility. Like all the members of the international community, including those parties most directly involved, Portugal believes that only the United Nations settlement plan, endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), can serve as the framework for a peaceful and balanced transition of Namibia to independence, and assure its people the right to decide on their own future through free elections under United Nations control, as a guarantee of recognition internationally.

125. This position of principle must, however, take into account those difficulties experienced in the application of resolution 435 (1978), as well as the importance and significance of the initiatives and contacts which have taken place in the meantime, on both the bilateral and the regional levels, to eliminate those obstacles and ensure a peaceful solution to the problem.

126. The Portuguese Government has followed and is supporting the efforts made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the OAU, the front-line States, the Western contact group and SWAPO. It does so in the hope that this will lead to the establishment of a climate of mutual confidence between the parties involved which could bring South Africa to accept in practice resolution 435 (1978). My Government also views positively the agreements reached this year by the States of the region, in particular the agreement of Lusaka, between Angola and South Africa, dealing with the control machinery for military withdrawal from Angolan territory. My delegation therefore condemns all delaying tactics which contribute to increasing the danger to the security and stability of the region, in particular the insistence of the Pretoria Government on maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia, defying internationally accepted compromises, in particular with other countries of the region, such as Angola, as well as all other acts which, under the guise of strengthening the role of the United Nations, are in fact aimed at undermining the negotiations which are under way and discrediting the countries directly involved or disputing the legitimacy of their initiatives.

127. Because of the language in which some of the provisions of the draft resolutions before us are formulated, and in view of the discriminatory references made therein to certain countries, my delegation is not in a position to support all of the draft resolutions. What it believes is extremely important is the intensification of all sincere efforts designed to come to an urgent, negotiated, peaceful and internationally acceptable solution of the question of Namibia. It therefore reaffirms its full support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which reflects the will of the international community to achieve the liberation of the Territory and to contribute to the development and progress of an independent and sovereign Namibia, a full-fledged Member of the United Nations.

128. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Like the question of *apartheid*, the question of Namibia is at the core of African concerns. Regarding these two questions, Africa, standing in unity and solidarity, does and will do its utmost to eradicate those two evils that impair its dignity and jeopardize its economic and social development. For those considerations, the African Heads of State, while ready for a dialogue which would lead to a negotiated and thus a peaceful solution of these problems, remain more than ever determined to ensure that law and justice will prevail over force.

129. Senegal, through its President, Mr. Abdou Diouf, has made the item currently under consideration one of the constants of its foreign policy since the very accession of Senegal to independence. It is upon the initiative of Senegal that there is a yearly International Day of Solidarity with the Namibian People, and it was my delegation which had the honour of presiding over the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence held in Paris in April 1983. My country also actively participates in activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

130. The interest my country attaches to the question of Namibia stems from its dedication to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and also from our support for the restoration of stability in Africa and the consolidation of international peace and security. No one can doubt that those two objectives cannot be fully achieved as long as Namibia remains under the yoke of South Africa; therefore, my country must explore all ways and means which could lead to the independence of Namibia. The Head of State of Senegal has always advocated, both internationally and nationally, the full and speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which includes a plan for the settlement of the Namibian question. Accordingly, we cannot endorse any prerequisites to its implementation; and, in the same spirit, we have always appealed to the countries of the Western contact group to step up their pressure on South Africa.

131. On that basis, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

132. However, my delegation considers that the formulation of some paragraphs in the draft resolutions contained in that report should be reworded. I should like to mention, for example, selective condemnations. My delegation considers that, in so far as condemnation is concerned, objectivity and credibility require that it be total rather than selective. That has become a rule because in similar circumstances and cases our Assembly has indeed abided by that provision. The texts we are considering today would remain valid in substance in the absence of these selective condemnations or recriminations. That is why my delegation will vote in favour of the amendments in document A/39/L.23 to L.25, except for the amendment to draft resolution B, contained in paragraph 2 of document A/39/L.24, and the amendment to draft resolution D contained in paragraph 1 of document A/39/L.25. Hence my delegation abstained in the voting on those two amendments.

133. My delegation supports and will in the future continue to support the Namibian people to ensure the triumph of their inalienable right to independence. We give similar support to the Palestinian cause and to the eradication of *apartheid*.

134. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): France is now more than ever aware of the situation in southern Africa and in particular the situation in Namibia. We have continually called for independence for Namibia in keeping with the modalities stipulated in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My Government voted in favour of Security Council resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) calling for the speedy implementation of the United Nations settlement plan so as to ensure the end of the illegal occupation of that Territory by South Africa.

135. Everyone knows very well the circumstances that caused France to suspend its active participation in the work of the Western contact group in December 1983. That was a solemn way of indicating its strict adherence to resolution 435 (1978).

136. Today we can only note with interest the official letter addressed by the President of the People's Republic of Angola to the Secretary-General [*A/39/688*], to whom my country wishes to pay a particular tribute in view of the personal attention he constantly gives to the questions of southern Africa. My delegation hopes that recent developments will contribute to establishing the conditions indispensable to the settlement of the Namibian question.

137. While awaiting such a settlement, which we hope will be achieved without delay, France intends to maintain a position which will make it possible to make a contribution to the conclusion of the process leading to the independence of the Territory.

138. For that reason, my delegation intends to take a position of abstention in principle regarding these five draft resolutions.

139. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): First, please allow me to reiterate and solemnly declare here and now that my delegation fully and unequivocally supports self-determination and genuine independence for Namibia. This commitment is total and immutable.

140. Secondly, my delegation supports the consensus that has emerged that South Africa should relinquish its hold on Namibia in order to allow Namibians to exercise self-determination and to enjoy the fruits of independence in terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

141. Thirdly, my delegation welcomes the release from prison of Andimba Toivo ya Toivo and expresses the cherished hope that other political prisoners will also be released.

142. Having stated this, my delegation, however, has reservations in respect of, first, the principle of singling out some Member States for selective condemnation or criticism. Such a procedure may be construed as sheltering some States for their double standards, thereby creating a credibility gap. Secondly, because of geographical predicament, practical difficulties and Malawi's belief in the policy of contact and dialogue, my delegation is unable to support the policy of isolation, sanctions and some of the language formulations contained in some of the preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolutions.

143. For these reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A and B contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and it will be recalled that it abstained in the vote on the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25. We shall, however, vote in favour of draft resolutions C, D and E.

144. Mr. CHETTY (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka fully supports the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole, legitimate representative, for the establishment of a free, unified and independent Namibia.

145. We believe, in this context, that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the means through which Namibian independence could be brought about. It should be implemented in its entirety without pre-conditions. Issues such as the linkage of the Cuban presence in Angola with the independence of Namibia are extraneous and should not be advanced as reasons for the delay or denial of Namibian independence.

146. Sri Lanka's consistent policy at the United Nations on all issues has been that we have not favoured the condemning or denouncing by name of countries with which we have diplomatic relations. Our carrying out of this policy in United Nations voting does not, however, imply any diminution of our position on the question of Namibia which we have summarized just now and indicated in our statement in the general debate [*5th meeting*] under this item.

147. Sri Lanka has supported some of the amendments and opposed some others contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25. Had we been given an opportunity of voting separately on the amendments to paragraph 49 of draft resolution A contained in paragraphs 5 (*b*) and (*c*) of document A/39/L.23, we would have voted in favour of them. Similarly, on the amendments to draft resolution D, contained in document A/39/L.25, our vote would have been cast differently had we been given the opportunity to vote separately. We regret that we were denied that opportunity.

148. We intend to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions under this item when each of them is put to the vote as a whole, as contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

149. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium, which is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, regrets that, despite the diplomatic efforts carried out during the past 12 months, no substantive progress has been achieved in the attainment of independence for Namibia.

150. With respect to this situation, the international community can only maintain and endeavour to make more effective the pressure it is exerting on the Government of South Africa to ensure that it ceases to block the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In that regard, my country last month joined in the consensus by which all countries members of the United Nations Council for Namibia adopted the report of the Council.

151. However, on that occasion, my delegation pointed out that it still had reservations on some of the draft resolutions included in the report and that it would explain those reservations at the time of the voting in the General Assembly.

152. In reference to the comments that have just been made by the representative of Ireland in this regard on behalf of the European Community, my delegation believes it is useful to recall some of the principles motivating Belgium in its international relations, which it feels should not be discarded even in the present situation.

153. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C, on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, while recalling here the very strong reservations which explained its abstention in the voting on the financial implications yesterday in the Fifth Committee. My country will also vote in favour of draft resolution E on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

154. On draft resolutions A, B and D, concerning respectively the situation in Namibia, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the dissemination of information, my delegation will abstain. The reasons for this triple abstention are the same as those we explained last year. The wording that caused difficulties for us in the past has been maintained and in some cases even strengthened.

155. For example, in draft resolution A, my country cannot agree with those paragraphs which call for support for armed struggle and for the breaking off of all relations with South Africa, or those which systematically denigrate the actions of some countries.

156. Nor can my country recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. No party has ever obtained or claimed such recognition in Belgium. Indeed, that would be contrary to the ideals of freedom and pluralism that are the basis of our national democratic system. We therefore cannot attribute to SWAPO—and my delegation hopes that it understands this—a title which only the Namibian people can grant it, through free elections.

157. My delegation believes also that the diplomatic efforts exerted in southern Africa during the past 12 months deserve—despite the fact that so far the results have been very limited—a more subtle interpretation than that given in this draft resolution.

158. In draft resolution B, my delegation cannot accept the unjustified attacks upon the United States and the criticism directed at other Western members of the Security Council.

159. With regard to draft resolution D, on the dissemination of information, my delegation believes that the volume of this programme of information and mobilization is excessive. This programme, moreover, contains various points of view that are not shared by my Government.

160. Having said that, I would state that my country understands the impatience—indeed, the exasperation—of the Namibian people and the countries most directly involved with the consequences of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. We are not losing sight of the fact that this question, with its tragic consequences, results from the challenge flung by Pretoria at the international community. We shall continue to work for Namibia's rapid accession to independence.

161. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): When my delegation spoke in the debate on this question [*81st meeting*], we expressed a number of reservations about the draft resolutions appearing before us today.

162. In this connection, I should like to emphasize that it has long been a matter of concern that,

because of language which is unacceptable to us, Australia has been obliged to distance itself in the United Nations Council for Namibia and in the General Assembly over a number of years from resolutions and programmes with which the Australian Government is in basic agreement.

163. During the general debate, in which approximately 100 delegations participated, there was a clear and unanimous message: Namibia must be brought to the earliest possible independence, in accordance with the United Nations plan, and South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory must be terminated.

164. Yet, turning to the draft resolutions before us, we find language which deliberately sets out to divide rather than to mobilize the common purpose of the international community.

165. The Australian Government is deeply concerned about the situation in Namibia resulting from South Africa's occupation of the Territory. We fully support the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and we support programmes to disseminate information and mobilize international public opinion in support of Namibia. Yet, in the past, we have been unable to accept resolutions which were similar to draft resolutions A, B and D and which dealt precisely with these subjects, because of the language in which they were couched.

166. As I said earlier, my delegation has sought to have the United Nations Council for Namibia and the General Assembly adopt resolutions which will be more widely acceptable. We supported the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25, proposed by the representative of the United States, because we have consistently argued against the selective and arbitrary naming of Member States in General Assembly resolutions. We regret that these amendments were not carried. If they had been carried in their entirety, my delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolutions B, C, D and E and abstained on draft resolution A. This would have represented a distinct change in Australia's voting pattern, as compared to recent years. We would have done so notwithstanding the fact that draft resolutions A and B—and A in particular—contain elements which we do not fully support. As the amendments were not carried, we shall now abstain on draft resolutions A, B and D and support draft resolutions C and E.

167. The draft resolutions before us contain a number of difficulties that we have previously elaborated on in the Assembly. For example, my delegation is unable to accept references to SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, although we acknowledge that SWAPO has an essential role to play in the settlement regulations.

168. Nor can we accept endorsement of armed struggle as a means of bringing about Namibian independence, as this runs counter to the very Charter of the United Nations. Having said this, however, we do understand the frustrations which have led many countries and peoples to argue that if peaceful methods do not produce the necessary results, force may inevitably occur as a last resort to end institutionalized discrimination in southern Africa.

169. We are concerned also with exaggerated allegations concerning co-operation by "Western countries" with South Africa. I do not propose here to outline in detail the concerns we have where such allegations are made on each and every occasion; I would simply register that such criticism is arbitrary and selective. A further difficulty we have is that we do not accept that South Africa ought to be excluded from international organizations. It is through its membership in such bodies that South Africa comes face to face with the force of international opposition to its unacceptable policies in relation to *apartheid* and Namibia.

170. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries—Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark—in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia.

171. The Nordic countries remain firmly convinced that the people of Namibia must be permitted as soon as possible to determine their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). They are deeply concerned that South Africa continues to lay down extraneous conditions for co-operating in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. The Nordic countries reiterate the view that the settlement plan alone provides a universally accepted framework for Namibian independence.

172. The Nordic countries deeply regret that again this year they will not be able to support all the draft resolutions. This is all the more regrettable since we strongly support the overall objective—namely, freedom and independence for Namibia.

173. The draft resolutions before us contain an increasing number of elements which cause us difficulties of principle. I shall now outline these difficulties in general terms.

174. First, as we have stated on a number of occasions, the Nordic countries cannot accept endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle. One of the basic principles of the Organization is to promote peaceful solutions to international problems. For the same reason, we cannot support calls for military assistance.

175. Secondly, owing to the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States.

176. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. We believe that this procedure, which is getting increasingly common, makes it more difficult than before to maintain the international consensus on the question of Namibia.

177. Fourthly, all political parties enjoying popular support in Namibia must be allowed to participate in a political process through free and fair elections. SWAPO is such a party and must be part of any solution in Namibia. However, we have reservations concerning formulations which prejudice the outcome of free elections.

178. Fifthly, we are also this year concerned about the substantial additional expenditures which the proposed large meetings away from Headquarters involve. The Nordic countries support the general principle embodied in General Assembly resolution

31/140 that United Nations bodies shall meet at their established Headquarters.

179. The Nordic countries hope that the future recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia will be changed accordingly, thereby making it possible for our long-standing support for the Namibian people to find expression in only affirmative votes.

180. Mr. WERNDL (Federal Republic of Germany): I believe the position of the Federal Republic of Germany on the question of Namibia is well known. There has been no change in that position. As Federal Foreign Minister Genscher repeatedly stated, most recently on 6 June before the German Bundestag, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is and remains the one and only basis for the internationally recognized independence of Namibia.

181. Being a member of the Western contact group, the Federal Republic of Germany, as in recent years, will abstain on all draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia. As has been pointed out by the contact group collectively on similar occasions in recent years, such abstention is motivated by procedural reasons. As a member of the contact group, the Federal Republic of Germany might be involved in negotiations on the implementation of the Western settlement plan endorsed by the Security Council in 1978. In order not to prejudge the outcome of those negotiations in any way, the Federal Republic of Germany must refrain from associating itself with the draft resolutions before the General Assembly in either a positive or negative manner. Mainly for this reason, but also out of certain reservations with regard to some financial implications contained in the draft resolutions, my delegation will abstain.

182. Mr. van der STOEL (Netherlands): The Netherlands has repeatedly condemned South Africa for continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of the unanimous opinion of the international community. My Government has consistently joined other Members of this Organization in appealing to South Africa to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). For the Namibian problem to be solved, South Africa must be prevailed upon to co-operate without further delay or pre-conditions in carrying out the settlement plan endorsed by resolution 435 (1978) which, *inter alia*, provides for free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and the establishment of an independent and sovereign State of Namibia.

183. The Netherlands will continue to encourage all efforts aimed at bringing about this goal and overcoming the obstacles to which the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence has been held hostage too long. As Namibia has always been a particular responsibility and concern of the United Nations, it is our duty, as Members of this world body, to attract the widest possible support for these efforts. To our deep regret, however, we are faced once again with draft resolutions that include many elements which are more likely to create controversy and division than to lay the foundations for concerted action by the Organization in pursuit of our common goal.

184. My delegation has no choice, therefore, but to abstain on some of the draft resolutions presented to us.

185. As an Organization whose Charter commits its Members to search for solutions by peaceful means, the United Nations cannot in good conscience encourage the use of violence. For this reason, the Netherlands dissociates itself from any wording which, explicitly or implicitly, condones the use of force, such as the endorsement of armed struggle. Furthermore, the Netherlands cannot agree to calls for the total isolation of South Africa because the imposition of such measures would run counter to the objective of seeking international agreement on Namibia's independence.

186. In our view, SWAPO is a major political force in Namibia and as such it has participated from the outset in the negotiations concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). But my Government feels that to designate SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people would prejudge the outcome of the free and democratic elections provided for in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Nor can the Netherlands Government subscribe to attempts to politicize the specialized agencies and to interfere with their autonomy. We also attach great importance to the principle of universality and respect for the division of competences of United Nations bodies embodied in the Charter.

187. In our view, one of the most reprehensible aspects of the draft resolutions before us is the arbitrary and unjustified accusations hurled at individual Member States or groups of countries. My Government strongly rejects this practice of selective name-calling as unworthy of the Organization. The aspersions cast on one particular group of Member States can only serve the interests of those who are less concerned with strengthening the resolve of the United Nations to deal effectively with this difficult issue than with exploiting it for their own narrow objectives.

188. Against this background, my delegation has voted in favour of all amendments introduced by the United States. In this context we would urge the United Nations Council for Namibia henceforward to resist the introduction of those elements into draft resolutions and thereby enhance this body's ability to contribute to international efforts to bring about Namibia's independence.

189. In view of the considerations just mentioned, the Netherlands will abstain on draft resolution A and on draft resolution D concerning the dissemination of information. We will also abstain on draft resolution B concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The early exercise by the Namibian people of its internationally recognized right to self-determination and independence should not be impeded because of the situation in a neighbouring country. At the same time, the Netherlands Government supports the efforts of all parties concerned to reach a common understanding on issues relevant to the stability of the region as a whole once the implementation of the Namibian independence plan is set in motion. The immediate cessation of South African aggression against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Angola and the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country would certainly contribute to a climate of confidence conducive towards this end. But I wish to emphasize that, in the opinion of the Netherlands, the independence of Namibia remains the essential and primary responsibility of the

United Nations, which must necessarily take precedence over other considerations.

190. The Netherlands will vote in favour of draft resolution C concerning the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. It cannot be inferred from our positive vote, however, that the Netherlands agrees to all aspects of the programme of work. In particular, we feel strongly that the request to the Council, in paragraph 19, to hold a series of plenary meetings during 1985 away from Headquarters, will require considerable additional cost in return for a very questionable additional benefit. At a time when most Member States and the United Nations itself have increasingly been forced to observe financial self-restraint, it cannot be beyond the Council to find less extravagant projects with a greater potential benefit to the people of Namibia on which to spend the funds that could be saved by holding the meetings at Headquarters.

191. Finally, the Netherlands does not share the view that the United Nations Council for Namibia must enjoy the same rights and privileges in international organizations as are reserved for States.

192. Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): My delegation would like to make clear that its abstentions in the votes on the draft resolutions concerning Namibia now before the Assembly are purely procedural and indicate neither approval or disapproval of their contents. We do regret, however, that the amendments proposed a few moments ago were not adopted by this body. Canada is again abstaining on the substantive resolutions this year because we are a member of the contact group, which has been involved in the past and, indeed, may be involved in the future in negotiations concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We would not wish, therefore, to prejudge the outcome of any negotiations by our votes on these draft resolutions. Canada's basic position was stated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his statement to the Assembly on 25 September:

> "We are also grieved that the people of Namibia are still denied their independence after a century of colonial rule. South Africa must set a date to implement Namibia's independence under Security Council resolution 435 (1978)." [*7th meeting, para. 97.*]

193. We join other delegations in looking forward to the day when Namibia will be free and will join the ranks of our membership.

194. Mr. BARMA (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): The debate on the question of Namibia, and even the debate which has been devoted to the question of *apartheid*, have clearly shown to what extent South Africa continues to defy the international community by its illegal occupation of Namibia and its base policies of *apartheid*. It is unquestionable that all delegations here present, even those which did not take part in the debate, quite strongly denounce and condemn South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia and reject its abject policy of *apartheid*.

195. It is in this spirit that the foreign policy of my country, Chad, has always been pursued, since we have always worked and will always work, in so far as possible, for the fraternal Namibian people, under the wise and responsible leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, to accede to freedom and independence in accordance with the United Nations plan, which was endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—a resolution which has been accepted by all the parties concerned.

196. Whereas the United Nations, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, was about to implement this Plan, South Africa, in order unjustly to hold up the independence of the Territory, has set in motion problems which are quite contrary to the spirit and letter of resolution 435 (1978).

197. As we did last year, we would like to reiterate that there should be no link established between the independence of Namibia and the presence of foreign troops in Angola because that is a matter which concerns two sovereign independent States—Angola and Cuba. It is by no means accurate to say that Cuban troops in any way pose a threat to a heavily armed South Africa. It is rather South Africa which represents a threat to its neighbours, particularly Angola, a considerable part of whose territory it occupies.

198. We would therefore urge South Africa's friends to exert appropriate pressure on that country to bring it to abide by the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations by unconditionally liberating Namibia and by completely giving up its policy of *apartheid*. Undoubtedly, it will be retorted, with some reason, that this attitude, far from leading the Government of South Africa to heed these appeals, will encourage it to persist in its policy of *apartheid* and its occupation of Namibia. My delegation is not entirely convinced by this view and considers that as far as self-determination for the Namibian people is concerned, the process of negotiation under way, although slow and difficult, will undoubtedly lead eventually to the much desired independence of Namibia.

199. My delegation sincerely believes, therefore, that it would be judicious not to discourage those States which, like the United States, are trying to do the best they can by approaching South Africa in order to try and induce it to grant independence to Namibia. Of course, each and every one of us recognizes that pressures exerted on South Africa have not proved as decisive as the international community had hoped they might be. We can only regret this state of affairs. Nevertheless, we do not believe that a condemnation by name of particular States Members of the Organization is likely to facilitate a solution to the Namibian problem. However, I hope we will be properly understood; our position should not be construed to mean that we are encouraging any sort of collaboration with South Africa. This is far from our thoughts. The idea of our delegation is that selective condemnations, at whatever States they be aimed, frequently produce results which are contrary to those that we are seeking.

200. That is why my delegation, in accordance with its traditional policies, voted in favour of the amendments introduced in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25. In so doing, we believe that avoiding selective condemnation by no means detracts from the substance of the draft resolutions on Namibia, with which we are in agreement. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia while at the same time entering express reservations on those paragraphs which selectively condemn certain States Members of the Organization.

201. Mrs. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Although my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions contained in document A/39/24, we wish to place on record our reservation on any paragraph in any of them which seeks to commit us to the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. For reasons which are well known to the Assembly and which have often been stated in the past, Botswana is in no position to participate in such sanctions.

202. Mr. GBEZERA-BRIA (Central African Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My country, the Central African Republic, has continuously and firmly reiterated that Namibia should be independent without any pre-conditions. There could be no compromise with regard to the right of the Namibian people to self-determination under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO. Therefore there must be an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa so that Namibia may accede to independence and freedom without linking it to extraneous considerations, which in fact have to do with the full and complete sovereignty of Angola and South Africa, and without its being subject to any pretext for destabilization in the region. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must therefore be implemented in its entirety.

203. My country's position on this matter cannot be called in question; nor can the will of the international community be challenged. Indeed, with regard to Namibia, there exists a collective responsibility in the application of decisions which have been taken. There also exists a complacency which comforts South Africa in its arrogant persistence in perpetuating its illegal occupation, with no chance in sight for a negotiated settlement which would not only lead to the international sovereignty of Namibia, but also guarantee peace in southern Africa. The important role which is played by the United States does not exclude such collective responsibility, and it is that collective responsibility which is tested in the difficult and delicate negotiations under way which must be encouraged and the merits of which must be recognized.

204. Thus, while voting in favour of the draft resolutions as a whole, my delegation could not support certain provisions, in particular those which selectively condemn one State or another, that is, the United States, which is endeavouring to reach a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

205. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): South Africa is the only régime which has an institutionalized system of racism, *apartheid*. All the Members of the Assembly know very well and very much about the racist policies and the crimes that the South African régime has been perpetrating against humanity. We have all read about and heard the cries of the 3.5 million black workers who have been removed from their homelands; about the strikes of over 800,000 students and millions of workers; and about many other examples of public and popular outcry against racism and the *apartheid* policies of the South African régime.

206. On the other hand, the involvement of the United States—not forgetting the involvement of the Zionist régime in the Middle East—in South Africa is well known, not only to the General Assembly, but also to the American people and their senators. This is why demonstrators occupied the South African embassy and its many consulates in Washington, D.C. and in other American states, in opposition to the policies of the United States regarding South Africa and, indeed, in opposition to the policies of the South African régime.

207. In spite of all that, United States-owned transnational companies are still very active and apparently very productive and prolific in South Africa. There is nothing secret about it. Even the American mass media—channel 13—have disseminated information about the exceptionally high level of profit and the accumulation of wealth enjoyed by the American-owned companies in South Africa. Those companies, thanks to the cheap and abundant manpower and raw materials, which essentially belong to those poor people, made a profit of 1,500 per cent last year. This easily explains the reason behind the poverty of the indigenous people of South Africa and also the profound interest of the United States Government in its dealings with South Africa. It is that same illegitimate wealth which constitutes the backbone of the constructive engagement of the United States, which is intended to serve its exploitative, inhumane and destructive role in South Africa, and I shall therefore call it American "destructive engagement".

208. This unholy, sinister engagement has a wide range of activities and objectives which are embodied in the phrase which the President of the United States is quoted as using: "the strategic value of South Africa". One of the many dangerous and anti-human elements of this destructive engagement is United States co-operation with the régime of South Africa in the field of military and nuclear technology. *The Wall Street Journal* of 28 November 1984 stated the following:

> "One of the six countries that have not signed the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, South Africa, has the necessary technology and equipment, raw uranium and scientists to fashion at least a crude nuclear bomb."

The same paper continued:

> "Indeed, Western countries have little leverage over South Africa. What few pieces of the nuclear puzzle South Africa lacks have mostly been given or sold to them by the United States and others."

And then the article continues:

> "In 1957, under the 'Atoms for Peace' programme, the United States signed a 50-year co-operation agreement with South Africa. In 1961 South Africa built its first nuclear reactor with United States technology. The United States has agreed to supply enriched uranium, uranium fuel, to that reactor."

209. These and many other examples bear witness to the role of the United States Government in South Africa. It is this sinister destructive engagement that is immediately responsible for the perpetration of the crimes of *apartheid* in South Africa and also for the perpetuation and prolongation of the *apartheid* régime in that part of the world. Had it not been for the sinister role of this collaboration between the United States and South Africa, the South African régime would have died long ago, and our oppressed fellow man in South Africa and, as a matter of fact, the entire population of Africa, would have been rid of that régime.

210. The South African Catholic Bishops' Conference, as you know, has condemned the policies of the South African régime in that part of the world. A

report by the Conference states that "the South African police behaved like an occupying army controlling enemy territory while combating recent black unrest in the townships."

211. The United States Administration and the Zionist régime in the Middle East are historically known as the most adamant supporters of South Africa, and their joint collaboration with that régime deserves the explicit condemnation of the entire international community. That is why my delegation, regarding it as a personal religious duty as well as being the position of my Government and my people, voted against the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25.

212. I have to congratulate you, Mr. President, for this defeat that was so swiftly and effectively inflicted upon the enemies of the African people under your leadership. I must also sincerely congratulate and thank my dear friend Mr. Sinclair for his very intelligent and timely move requesting approval by a two-thirds majority. Today's record has made it evident that, in spite of all the United States intimidations, the oppressed can be victorious and they will be indeed.

213. Mr. LUNA MENDOZA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted on the question of Namibia. The position of Peru on this question is well known. We firmly support the exercise by the people of Namibia of their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. In that connection we call for the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

214. We cannot, however, agree with the mentioning by name of specific countries in the draft resolutions before us. Such singling out is discriminatory not only as a practice but also in the light of the reality of the international situation and of the Power that is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia.

215. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): The Government of Vanuatu has instructed our delegation to support the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia contained in its report [*A/39/24, part four, chap. I*]. In supporting the draft resolutions in that document the Government of Vanuatu regrets that language capable of gaining a consensus was not used.

216. It is our belief that Namibia's independence will be achieved by a concert of co-operation and good will and through the efforts of the people of Namibia themselves, with the support of a broad international constituency. Concrete action in support of Namibia's people is, of course, essential. Unfulfilled promises, empty sloganeering and strident rhetoric will gain nothing. Had we been responsible for the wording of these draft resolutions, we would have used different language. However, such was not the case, and we will, because of their primary thrust, support the draft resolutions as recommended by the Council.

217. We will do so for two basic reasons. One, we respect the recognized expertise and authority of the Council. Two, we firmly believe that it is essential to send a strong message of support to the people of Namibia and their representative, SWAPO, particularly at this moment in history, while at the same time sending an equally strong message of disapproval to Pretoria. Our vote is directed against no country but South Africa and for no people but the people of Namibia.

218. We believe that we, the nations of the world, must finally fulfil our promise to Namibia's people and stand firmly once and for all against South Africa's injustice. We must lead by example and not just word in rejecting the continued illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of international public opinion. To us, these factors outweigh deficiencies in the language and thrust of parts of the draft resolutions.

219. While we do not approve of all of that language, we were compelled to vote against the proposed changes because of our aforementioned support for the Council and for Namibia's people. Nothing should be read into our position, nor should any interpretation be given other than a heartfelt empathy with the colonized people of Namibia. We have and will continue to state to our friends our objections to the imperfect language. We will also continue to make what we feel are constructive suggestions. We hope that some of these suggestions, and those made by others, will find their way into future draft resolutions.

220. It is our firm hope that, should the situation in that country persist and we consider similar draft resolutions next year, such draft resolutions may be more precise, far less selective and more capable of eliciting broad support. We believe that selectivity is neither constructive nor accurate. However, by the same token, we do not believe it is appropriate to change the language of the Council's recommendations at this time. We do not doubt that in the future greater thought will be given to the words expressed today by all of us, both those who will support the draft resolutions and those who will not be able to.

221. Reflection, reappraisal, re-evaluation and interaction can only serve us all. In the process we may strengthen the opposition to South Africa here at the United Nations and swell the ranks of those who vote to support the Council's recommendations.

222. Mr. GARCÍA-MORENO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In a recent statement on this question [*83rd meeting*], the delegation of Colombia reiterated its unequivocal support for the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia and renewed its unswerving solidarity with that country's people. The cause of Namibia, as we have said before, is a priority objective of our foreign policy.

223. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of all the draft resolutions that have been submitted to the Assembly today. However, we have reservations with regard to the wording of paragraphs in which specific countries are singled out for condemnation. We believe that draft resolutions that come before the Assembly should seek the desired balance and avoid any language that might lead to confrontation rather than co-operation.

224. The authors of these important initiatives, which are aimed at ending the illegal occupation of Namibia, should find formulas that could enjoy the support of the overwhelming majority of the international community.

225. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): My delegation's general reservations on certain of the draft resolutions in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia have been expressed by the representative of Ireland speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Community.

226. The five members of the contact group were involved in the formulation of the United Nations settlement plan and are likely to play a role in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has therefore been our custom not to adopt a substantive position on the draft resolutions on Namibia placed before the General Assembly. For that reason my delegation will once again abstain in the voting on those draft resolutions.

227. Mr. MALINGA (Swaziland): The Swaziland delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on Namibia before the General Assembly because their main thrust seeks to obtain the long-overdue independence of Namibia. It is our wish that our fellow southern Africans be given an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

228. Owing to well-known reasons dictated to us by circumstances of geographic sensitivity, my delegation will register, for the record, its reservation on all paragraphs which contain elements that advocate economic sanctions against South Africa. We also do not endorse the use of arms by both sides as a means of solving the problem of Namibia.

229. Mr. TOMBIA (Angola): My delegation rejects the allegation made by the representative of the United States of America concerning the establishment of a Liaison Office in Windhoek. In the Lusaka talks referred to by the representative of the United States, no agreement was reached with anybody about the establishment of a so-called Liaison Office. The People's Republic of Angola did agree in those talks that the United States would be invited to participate in the joint commission only at the invitation of the parties concerned, just in case of any disagreement in the process of disengagement. Therefore, the allegation made by the representative of the United States of America that there was an agreement, or any kind of understanding with the United States to establish the so-called Liaison Office, is false.

230. That is why my delegation voted against all the amendments presented by the delegation of the United States, in particular the amendment contained in paragraph 4 of document A/39/L.23 concerning paragraph 38 of draft resolution A.

231. There is not a shadow of a doubt that my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us.

232. Mr. HAPPI TCHANKOU (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to explain my vote on the amendment by the United States which is contained in paragraph 3 of document A/39/L.23 and which concerns paragraph 21 of draft resolution A. We voted against this amendment, but the voting display showed that we abstained. I should like the record to indicate that my delegation voted against that amendment. I should like to make it clear that the position of Cameroon on Namibia has been constant.

233. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting. However, before proceeding to the vote, in answer to a number of queries we have received, I wish to inform the Assembly that as soon as we have completed the present item on Namibia, we shall then proceed to take up the remaining items on our agenda covering various reports from the First Committee.

234. The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions A to E recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report [*ibid.*]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions is to be found in document A/39/813. The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on draft resolution A, entitled "The situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 39/50 A).

235. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will vote next on draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 39/50 B).

236. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Paraguay, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 148 votes to none, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/50 C).

237. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution D, entitled, "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/50 D).

238. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/50 E).[7]

239. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

240. Mrs. BETHEL-DALY (Bahamas): The Bahamas has always supported every initiative which we felt would somehow facilitate the long overdue attainment of independence for Namibia. Similarly, we have wasted no time, nor have we minced our words, in condemning those actions which have been barriers or obstacles to the achievement of Namibia's independence. As noted in our statement in the general debate [*28th meeting*] at the beginning of this session, we find it discouraging and even deplorable that the international community continues to be plagued by this issue year after year.

241. Because we believe that the policies of the racist régime of South Africa with regard to Namibia pose a direct threat to international security and peace and because it is our conviction that Namibians must exercise their inalienable rights as free human beings, through sovereignty and the establishment of democratic rule in that country, my delegation voted whole-heartedly in favour of the resolutions just adopted. Further, we support these resolutions because we believe that their general thrust underscores the important fact that Namibia's independence and the inherent dignity of its people should no longer be jeopardized through the intransigence and selfishness of another State, namely South Africa.

242. Having said this, my delegation is convinced that issues which are extraneous to these two basic and crucial elements of independence and democratic rule serve not to enhance the resolutions but rather to make them just another scapegoat for prolonged and unnecessarily complicated debates. In an effort to promote the call for equity and sound judgement my delegation voted in favour of the amendments to the seventeenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A and paragraph 5 of draft resolution D. As we see it, fundamentally, what is being called into question in the aforementioned seventeenth preambular paragraph is not the actions of an individual country but rather the rules and procedures of the Security Council, which should not be an issue in this context. With regard to paragraph 5 of draft resolution D, my delegation contends that the language of this paragraph fails to show any correlation between the objective thought and the methods to be employed. Our vote against the amendment to paragraph 38 of draft resolution A was determined by our belief that until Namibia achieves independence, no foreign Government should establish any type of representative office in that country, particularly since Namibia is currently being administered by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which represents the world Organization and consequently the individual States.

243. Finally, we believe that arbitrary name-calling is sometimes necessary. For example, the omission of reference to South Africa from the texts would make them meaningless. It would seem that, generally speaking, the repetitious and inconsistent references tend to compromise the balance of the texts and their possible future efficacy. We reiterate our point that independence and democratic rule for Namibia should be the focal point of this issue and neither will be gained through resolutions which would seem to give undue weight to other contentious aspects. My delegation trusts that these ideas will be considered in any future texts that may be deemed necessary.

244. Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria has consistently supported the right of the Namibian people to self-determination. We regard the United Nations plan for Namibia as offering the most promising way to end South Africa's illegal occupation and to facilitate peaceful transition to independence. We regret that issues outside the scope of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have so far prevented the implementation of the Namibian plan and consider it imperative that South Africa change its intransigent attitude.

245. For all these reasons, we would have liked to support all the draft resolutions submitted under this item. Unfortunately, some of these texts contain provisions which are unacceptable to Austria. Also, we understand the impatience and disappointment of the Namibian people in view of the protracted negotiating process. We remain convinced that, in the light of the principles and goals of the Charter of the United Nations, it is not up to the General Assembly to endorse the resort to armed struggle, nor should it encourage military support for such struggle.

246. Furthermore, Austria has strong reservations about the attempts to prejudge and influence the independent work of the Security Council, an attempt which is in contradiction with the relevant provisions of the Charter. Austria is fully aware of the significant and important role which SWAPO plays in the fight for Namibian independence, as well as in the negotiating process, a role which undoubt-

edly will continue. The final endorsement of this role, however, will be given by the Namibian people themselves in free and fair elections. The General Assembly must not prejudge this free and democratic expression of political will by the population of Namibia.

247. Austria also does not believe that the arbitrary singling out of certain States for condemnation either is justified or in any way advances the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. We therefore supported the amendments regarding these paragraphs.

248. We regret that, for the reasons mentioned above, Austria had to abstain on draft resolutions A, B and C. We wish to reiterate, however, that this in no way affects Austria's firm commitment to a peaceful and negotiated transition of Namibia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

249. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): During the recent debate on the question of Namibia, my delegation explained in detail Argentina's position on the item [*81st meeting*].

250. Argentina strongly condemns the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and supports the adoption by the Security Council of mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. Pursuant to that clear and firm position, we voted in favour of all the draft resolutions that were put to the vote. Nevertheless, we wish to reiterate the reservations which we expressed in the Fourth Committee [*see A/C.4/39/SR.19, para. 40*] as to the references to certain countries in the draft resolutions. Those reservations guided our position on each of the amendments voted on this afternoon.

251. Mr. BERMUDEZ (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Honduras voted in favour—and has done so every year—of all the resolutions on the question of Namibia, whose Territory and people are under the direct legal and political responsibility of the Organization. Our commitment is strong in favour of the cause of self-determination, independence and freedom for the Namibian people, as well as for the territorial integrity of Namibia. On 29 November of this year [*79th meeting*] we expressed our position in this respect in this forum.

252. On this basis, Honduras has continued to vote in favour of these resolutions without thereby implying that we share views as to the specific mention of countries other than South Africa, since the selective mention of certain States does not seem to us to be a justifiable practice in the Organization. In addition, Honduras adopts the same position in everything which relates to any State Member of the Organization.

253. Neither do we share views with regard to other aspects which are not in keeping with the fundamental requirements frequently reiterated in resolutions of this Organization to ensure that South Africa withdraws from Namibian territory, the duty of every State Member of the United Nations not to recognize that presence and illegal military occupation and, to that end, to support all efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Secretary-General aimed at reaching a peaceful solution of the Namibian question based on Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

254. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): The Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique strongly rejects the South African attempts to wreck Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to delay the independence of Namibia. We are also opposed to the so-called linkage. We hold the position that one people's sovereignty should not be used as a bargaining chip for another people's independence.

255. My Government has taken an active part in all efforts aimed at finding an immediate and just solution to the question of Namibia at the OAU, in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and here at the United Nations. We have therefore spared no effort in the joint undertaking by the front-line States with a view to immediately freeing Namibia from the colonial yoke. The People's Republic of Mozambique, together with other front-line States, played an important role in the efforts that led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorses the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We have engaged in this process on the understanding that only the genuine independence of Namibia and the eradication of *apartheid* can bring about peace and stability in the region.

256. I want to take this opportunity once again to reiterate our firm support for and solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Those were the reasons for our affirmative votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

257. Nevertheless, while supporting the view that the United Nations should consider taking every possible measure, including those envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the Organization, my delegation reiterates the fact that the People's Republic of Mozambique is not in a position to apply economic sanctions against South Africa.

258. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since the year 1946, that is, practically from the birth of the United Nations, Chile has rejected South Africa's alleged claims over the Territory of Namibia and has supported the various stages of the Namibian people's struggle. Its conduct as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia has always been consistent. Today we reiterate that decision and pledge Chilean support for the present and future of the Namibian cause.

259. However, my delegation must reiterate here what it has stated on several occasions, namely, that it does not consider it advisable to adopt the practice of bringing to this forum and in respect of this question accusations that would be better placed in the context of the East-West conflict and debated in other forums. A specific case in point is the unfelicitous drafting of paragraph 14 of draft resolution A, which is selective with regard to the general responsibility that members of the Security Council bear for the maintenance of international peace and security.

260. Furthermore, in this context we find specific mention of countries. Selectivity, in our view, is not a good practice and, ultimately, it affects the credibility of the resolutions concerned.

261. Likewise, my delegation does not consider it appropriate to refer to measures that fall within the Security Council's competence and believes that the way in which mention is made of technical financial bodies is counter to the autonomy of their constitu-

tional documents, which are based on purely technical considerations.

262. Mr. AOKI (Japan): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A, B and D. As we have explained on many occasions, we have serious reservations about a number of their provisions. For example, these resolutions contain many paragraphs which refer to and criticize by name particular Member States. My delegation does not believe that this name-calling will contribute to a solution of the problem. That is why we voted in favour of the amendments proposed by the United States.

263. In addition, with reference to draft resolution D, while my delegation attaches importance to the dissemination of information on Namibia, we believe that the information must be accurate, fair and balanced. It is also important that close co-operation and co-ordination be maintained between the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat so that the facilities of that Department will be utilized effectively and information disseminated in a co-ordinated manner. It is essential that limited financial and human resources be utilized as effectively as possible.

264. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions C and E, however, our affirmative vote should not be construed as support for all the paragraphs of those resolutions. My delegation's position, which it has made clear on various occasions, has not changed.

265. As in previous years, my delegation has reservations about some parts of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which we expressed in the debate on this agenda item [*81st meeting*].

266. My delegation has reservations also with regard to the dramatic increase in the budget appropriations. Again, although we recognize and appreciate the important role that the United Nations Fund for Namibia is playing, we have reservations regarding paragraph 5 of draft resolution E, which allocates $1 million from the regular budget. The Fund, it should be recalled, was established as a voluntary fund.

267. Mr. KOFA (Liberia): The policy of the Government of Liberia regarding the question of Namibia is well known. Liberia has repeatedly expressed its firm support and commitment to the concerted efforts of the international community to bring an end to the colonial and illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. Its membership in the United Nations Council for Namibia has further served as a constructive contribution to the achievement of this goal.

268. My delegation has voted in favour of the adoption of all the draft resolutions recommended by the Council in its report, because they reflect the general thrust of the Namibian liberation struggle for the attainment of self-determination, freedom and independence.

269. Having voted affirmatively, we take this opportunity to emphasize that we differ with the approach taken in the formulation of the provisions of the draft resolutions, which we feel could give rise to difficulties for some Member States, such as Liberia, and even resistance by others, in their implementation.

270. In this respect, Liberia reserves its position with regard to the following matters. We consider certain sections of resolutions A, B, and D that arbitrarily single out a few countries for exposure, criticism and condemnation while deliberately shielding other known and recognized culprits which are co-operating and collaborating with South Africa to be not only divisive but self-defeating.

271. Our vote, therefore, in favour of the amendments proposed by the United States delegation is to make clear our strong opposition to selective criticism and condemnation and does not in any way imply a radical departure from our position calling for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in its entirety. Liberia would have preferred similar language to that used in the resolution adopted at the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984.[8] The Liberian delegation had hoped that the Assembly would have adopted all the resolutions by consensus. We are deeply disappointed that it has not been possible to achieve such unanimity, but we expect that in the future this will be the case, since we all profess to have the same goal: self-determination, freedom and independence for Namibia at the earliest possible date.

272. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): The Turkish Government supports all efforts which are aimed at ensuring the swift accession of Namibia to complete independence in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My Government's view on this matter was expressed in a statement made during the general debate by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey [*20th meeting*] as well as in the debate on the question of Namibia [*81st meeting*].

273. In accordance with the firm support which we have committed ourselves to providing for the independence of Namibia, my delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Nevertheless, my delegation has a number of reservations in connection with certain paragraphs in draft resolutions A, B and D. Generally speaking, we do not approve of the idea of making express mention of certain countries or groups of countries when it is difficult to spell out the respective responsibilities. More specifically, my delegation has reservations about the references made to the Western countries, either as a group or individually, which appear in the seventeenth, twentieth and twenty-third preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 14, 21, 37, 44 and 49 of draft resolution A.

274. We also disapprove of a Western country and all the countries belonging to that region being mentioned by name in the third preambular paragraph and in paragraphs 3, 8, 9 and 11 of draft resolution B. We have a similar reservation in connection with the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 of draft resolution D.

275. Mr. MAGALHÃES (Brazil): The Brazilian Government supports all measures aimed at the prompt independence of Namibia. That is why we voted in favour of the five draft resolutions submitted for our attention by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

276. The Brazilian delegation, however, deems it necessary to place on record its reservations concerning the language of certain paragraphs of those draft resolutions, language which cannot be considered as

a positive contribution to our common objective: the granting of freedom and independence to the Namibian people.

277. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia because they represent the position of the Government of Lesotho on the question of Namibia.

278. In the vote on the amendments proposed by the United States, my delegation abstained on those amendments which unfairly singled out some countries by name while in fact there are many other countries which are engaged in similar activities. We have, however, voted against amendments that would distort the facts. I conclude by stating that my delegation has, as usual, difficulties with paragraphs which invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

279. Mr. AYE (Burma): The delegation of Burma would like to clarify that it has just voted in favour of all five draft resolutions on the question of Namibia in conformity with our firm and consistent support for the Namibian people in their brave struggle for national liberation, under the leadership of SWAPO. Burma is in complete agreement with the objectives expressed in the draft resolutions, which are directed towards compelling South Africa to abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which constitutes the basis for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

280. However, we regret to note that a number of the formulations in draft resolutions A, B and D have tended to be unfairly selective and partial, and their inclusion is not a positive contribution to the furtherance of the primary objective of our deliberations, which is the attainment of national independence by the people of Namibia. In such unfortunate circumstances, my delegation sees no alternative but to register its reservations to the form and content of certain paragraphs in draft resolutions A, B and D, but my delegation would like to reaffirm that by our positive vote on all five draft resolutions on the question of Namibia Burma has amply demonstrated its long-standing and continued support for the just cause of the Namibian people.

281. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): As in the past, we have supported all the draft resolutions before the Assembly concerning Namibia because we are anxious to secure early independence for Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and because we sympathize with the sense of frustration of all against South Africa's delaying tactics. That does not necessarily imply, however, that we are in full accord with every single provision contained in the draft resolutions, particularly draft resolution A. On such an important issue we feel that more effort should be expended in searching for a resolution which would command universal support.

282. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on the representative of Turkey, who will speak in his capacity as Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

283. Mr. HAKTANIR (Turkey): On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I would like to thank all those Member States which participated in the debate on the question of Namibia. The draft resolutions which the United Nations Council for Namibia recommended to the present session of the General Assembly have been adopted by the overwhelming majority of Member States. We thank those who voted in favour of the resolutions, thus making it clear to South Africa that the international community stands solidly behind the Namibian people in their struggle for justice, liberty and independence.

284. A large majority of Member States have, in the debate on this question, condemned the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa in defiance of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. They have demanded the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia and have stated that Namibia is a unique responsibility of the United Nations and one of the most serious problems facing the Organization. Many delegations have opposed the linking of Namibian independence with extraneous and irrelevant issues.

285. From the statements by Member States and the resolutions just adopted it is quite clear that the collective view of the international community is that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The General Assembly, by these resolutions, gives a mandate to the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue its extensive programme of work for the next year. It calls for appropriate action by Member States; it provides for increased action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

286. A number of Member States have abstained in the voting on the draft resolutions. The United Nations Council for Namibia would like to believe that these Member States still support the spirit of the resolutions adopted. The Council is confident that they too share with it the deep conviction that the people of Namibia must attain their right to self-determination and genuine independence in a united Namibia.

287. The firmness of our resolutions in recent years is a natural reaction to South Africa's continuing rejection of all efforts on the part of the United Nations to solve the Namibian question. It is, furthermore, a reflection of the deep disappointment of the oppressed people of Namibia, who have struggled for a century against the colonial occupation of their country.

288. The United Nations Council for Namibia, in conformity with its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, will continue its efforts to mobilize world opinion in support of the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, for self-determination, freedom and national independence.

289. Before concluding, I should like to recall what the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, said in his statement on 29 November:

> "As I speak now, my people have their ears glued to their transistor radios in the hope that my words before the General Assembly will rekindle outrage and invigorate the world community to take concrete measures to assure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)." [*78th meeting, para. 108.*]

290. The people of Namibia have put their trust in the United Nations; they have waited for almost 40 years for that trust to be fulfilled. The United

Nations Council for Namibia strongly believes that effective means to compel South Africa to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) are provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

AGENDA ITEM 45

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/61 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

AGENDA ITEM 46

Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 47

Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 48

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 49

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 50

Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 51

Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 52

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 54

Prevention of an arms race in outer space: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 56

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/72 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 57

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa:

(*a*) Implementation of the Declaration: report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research;

(*b*) Nuclear capability of South Africa:

- **(i) Report of the Disarmament Commission;**
- **(ii) Report of the Secretary-General**

AGENDA ITEM 58

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 60

Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly:

(*a*) Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures: report of the Disarmament Commission;

(*b*) Freeze on nuclear weapons;

(*c*) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;

(*d*) World Disarmament Campaign: report of the Secretary-General;

(*e*) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/73 E on a nuclear-arms freeze;

(*f*) Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*g*) Disarmament and international security: report of the Security Council;

(*h*) Regional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 61

Reduction of military budgets:

(*a*) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 64

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons:

(*a*) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 142

Use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind

291. The PRESIDENT: Before the Assembly proceeds to consider the reports of the First Committee, I shall call on the Secretary-General, who wishes to make a statement.

292. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The Assembly has before it at this session 64 draft resolutions dealing with disarmament. During the past weeks, the able and dedicated representatives in the First Committee have worked diligently to devise resolutions on almost every aspect of nuclear and conventional disarmament and arms limitation. Their efforts have been painstaking and thorough. I believe I would be failing in my responsibility as Secretary-General, however, if I did not take this occasion to voice my alarm at the current state of disarmament endeavours in the world. We must ask ourselves if we are truly committed to the first precept of the Charter of the United Nations, which is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

293. The Charter gives both the General Assembly and the Security Council responsibility for considering disarmament and the regulation of armaments. Today there is no more important task before us. The threat of nuclear catastrophe is not one issue among many. Preventing such a horror is the pre-condition of all our endeavours. The great tasks before the world Organization, the challenges of economic and social development, progress in human rights, the construction of a world of justice and human dignity—all will be in vain if we fail to prevent nuclear disaster.

294. Imperfect as it may be, the United Nations is the only existing expression of the entire international community. The common aspirations of the world's people must be articulated here, and none is more fundamental than the survival of humanity. I will not rehearse once more the terrifying statistics that seem to have numbed us with their repetition. Suffice it to say that a nuclear war could never remain limited and could never be won. Its effects would not be confined to the nuclear adversaries but would threaten the existence of all the peoples on this earth. It could lead to the extinction of humanity. Doomsday scenarios need not be proven; the existence of the risk is enough, for the worst need only happen once.

295. As I look across this Hall, I see the delegations of 159 member nations. Almost all the world's peoples are represented here. All of them—all of us—live under the nuclear threat. As Secretary-General of the Organization, with no allegiance except to the common interest, I feel the question may justifiably be put to the leading nuclear Powers: by what right do they decide the fate of all humanity? From Scandinavia to Latin America, from Europe and Africa to the Far East, the destiny of every man and woman is affected by their actions. No one can expect to escape the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war on the fragile structure of our planet. The responsibility assumed by the great Powers is now no longer to their populations alone: it is to every country and every people, to all of us.

296. No ideological confrontation can be allowed to jeopardize the future of humanity. Nothing less is at stake: today's decisions affect not only the present; they also put at risk succeeding generations. Like supreme arbiters, with our disputes of the moment we threaten to cut off the future and extinguish the lives of the innocent millions as yet unborn. There can be no greater arrogance. At the same time, the lives of all who lived before us may be rendered meaningless, for we have the power to dissolve in a conflict of hours or minutes the entire work of civilization, with all the brilliant cultural heritage of mankind.

297. For almost 40 years we have lived under the nuclear shadow. Many have claimed that it alone has kept peace in the world. If nuclear weapons are indeed peace-keepers, does it follow that they ought to be acquired by every nation on earth? On the contrary, it is clear that to rely on nuclear deterrence is to accept a perpetual community of fear. That is very far from the community of human worth and understanding foreseen by the Charter.

298. It is neither desirable nor feasible in the long term to find true stability through nuclear deterrence. It is not desirable because in the long term human values are inconsistent with the threat of the indiscriminate death of millions of our fellow men and women. No humane society that recognizes individual worth and dignity can contemplate such an action. Conversely, the very fear and hatred of an adversary believed to be capable of carrying out such an attack would destroy the basis of a civilized society.

299. Even if we ignore its inhuman aspects, in the long run can we really expect stability from a balance of fear and the suspicion that it breeds? With the accelerating pace of military technology, the need to

counter each new threat will become ever more frantic and desperate. Every innovation in arms will tend to destabilize the fragile balance. Every perceived advantage will lead to fears of first-strike capability and the resulting temptation, at a time of great crisis, to launch a pre-emptive attack. And will our scientific vanity allow us to forget the double fallibility we face from human and from technological error? Offensive capacity must certainly be reduced. Ultimately, however, there is no deterrence, since any initiation of nuclear hostilities would be to no one's advantage. This is made cruelly clear by suggestions that a "nuclear winter" could follow a nuclear strike, even without any retaliation. To launch any nuclear attack could then indeed be suicide. The fruits of such violence would fall equally and with grim justice on the initiator and the victim alike.

300. Six years ago in this Hall we decided on the fundamental objective facing all of us:

> "Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation". [*Resolution S-10/2, para. 18.*]

It remains our most acute and urgent task. Every representative in this room, I am sure, shares the hope that the meeting between the Foreign Ministers of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be a step in the direction that we all seek. Indeed, every one of us has a right to urge the start of a new and determined process of disarmament negotiations by the nuclear Powers. Next September we shall hold the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The corollary for horizontal non-proliferation under that Treaty was the undertaking given, particularly by the great Powers, to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament" [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex, art. VI*]. Is it reasonable to expect restraint in one direction and uncontrolled expansion in the other? With progress in both directions the Non-Proliferation Treaty could become the embryo of a treaty, however distant, for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

301. It is not for me to make detailed observations on the course of the negotiations to be undertaken. However, it seems clear that fundamental security needs have to be acknowledged and taken into account. Paradoxically, both sides have an interest in each other's security, since insecurity can only lead to mutual peril and to pre-emptive considerations. Given the enormous complexity of today's weaponry and the varying composition of arsenals, advantages in different spheres will have to be balanced against each other. Finally, serious talks can take place only at the negotiating table and not through the media. The international community will no longer be reassured by the mere appearance of progress.

302. United Nations Member States have at their disposal the world's only multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva. I have said on more than one occasion that its endeavours should not be made to depend upon progress on the bilateral side. Moreover, we can make a contribution to the bilateral process in various ways. I appeal for a renewed effort towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty. No single multilateral agreement could have a greater effect on limiting the further refinement of nuclear weapons. A comprehensive test-ban treaty is the litmus test of the real willingness to pursue nuclear disarmament. Is it wise to develop new classes of ever more lethal, ever more technically complex weapons, whose control is ever more difficult to verify? We are at the point of leaving the decision on humanity's future to the automatic—and fallible—reactions of computers. Talks on a comprehensive test ban have been in abeyance for too long, and their value has even been questioned. As with all arms-limitation negotiations, there will never be a perfect time to begin them in the opinion of all sides. The time to recommence these talks is now; they should not be delayed any further.

303. The time is equally pressing for talks on space weapons. It seems that, where weapons are concerned, the only way to halt a race is to prevent its starting. Once the race is under way, agreement is far more difficult. And the winner enjoys only a few insecure moments of victory before the other side catches up, leaving both to look back over yet more wasted human effort and ingenuity. There is no final advantage in the arms race. It is therefore crucial that a ban on weapons in the new theatre, outer space, be concluded at the earliest possible time, before it is once again too late.

304. Next year is the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. It is also the fortieth anniversary of the first and only use of nuclear weapons, at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. While we have so far avoided global conflagration, we have made only halting and inadequate progress in disarmament or arms limitation over these past 40 years. Discussions have taken on a life of their own. All too often it seems as if the players are only moving their lethal pawns in a global chess game. We cannot calculate the quantity of our precious and limited resources that has already been poured into the endless arms race.

305. At a time of uncertainty for the young and despair for the poor and the hungry, we have truly mortgaged our future to the arms race, both nuclear and conventional. Several brilliant studies have shown us how expenditure on arms distorts our economies. We know that development will be a casualty of the arms race. In this sense, the arms trade impoverishes the receiver and debases the supplier. Here there is a striking resemblance to the drugs trade. Yet we continue on the same course even when faced with the silent genocide of famine that today stalks millions of our fellow men and women. The international community has to focus and act on the link between disarmament and development. We should take concrete and far-sighted steps toward the conversion of arms industries from military to civilian production. And we should begin to redress some of the enormous imbalance between research on arms and research on arms limitation and reduction.

306. The role of the Secretary-General under the Charter requires him to confront any matter which may threaten international peace and security. It is my belief that nothing poses a greater threat to the international community than the continuing arms race, above all the nuclear-arms race. The leaders of the great Powers have recently expressed their commitment to the prevention of war between them. The announcement that their two Foreign Ministers will

soon meet is most welcome. I appeal to the two leaders to ensure that these talks lead to persistent, determined negotiations. I would also hope that they will eventually meet together in recognition of their responsibility for humanity's survival. I would urge them to enhance the prospects for disarmament by taking steps to strengthen the collective security framework afforded by the United Nations. The Organization and I are at their disposal.

307. Many words have been spoken in the cause of disarmament. We are all aware of the goals, as outlined in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*resolution S-10/2*]. Only the political decisions of Governments can take us towards the realization of these goals, and only the peoples of the world can urge their Governments to move in that direction. The Charter of the United Nations speaks of "We the peoples", since it was to fulfil their hopes that the Organization was created. Every person on this earth has a stake in disarmament. In the nuclear age, decisions affecting war and peace cannot be left to military strategists or even to Governments. They are indeed the responsibility of every man and woman. And it is therefore the responsibility of all of us in this chamber to break the cycle of mistrust and insecurity and respond to humanity's yearning for peace.

308. The PRESIDENT: I now request the Rapporteur of the First Committee, the representative of Chad, to present all the reports of the First Committee relating to disarmament.

309. Mr. KESSELY (Chad), Rapporteur of the First Committee (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour and the pleasure to present to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on its work on disarmament matters under agenda items 45 to 52, 54, 56 to 58, 60, 61, 64 and 142. These reports are contained in documents A/39/735 to 742, A/39/744, A/39/746 to 748, A/39/750, A/39/751, A/39/754 and A/39/760. In this connection, may I point out that the reports on the question of Antarctica and international security, under agenda items 66 to 69 and 143, will be presented at a subsequent meeting of the General Assembly. The group of 22 disarmament items was included on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly pursuant to previous resolutions adopted by the Assembly, with the exception of agenda item 142.

310. The great number of agenda items dealing with disarmament clearly indicates the growing concern which delegations are experiencing *vis-à-vis* world peace and international security and the efforts they are making to bring about disarmament.

311. In order to improve and streamline the Committee's work, we organized the general debate in two stages. The first stage consisted of a general debate on all disarmament items. The second stage was intended to gear the discussion to specific disarmament items, while at the same time allowing for a debate like that of the first stage. The two stages of the general debate lasted approximately four weeks. Thereafter, we had two weeks to consider draft resolutions submitted on these items. The Committee devoted 33 meetings between 17 October and 12 November to the general debate and statements on specific disarmament items. A large number of delegations took part in the debate, which made it possible to have a fruitful exchange of views.

312. Among the various subjects relating to disarmament, the Committee particularly focused on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, as well as bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons, the prevention of nuclear war, a nuclear-test ban, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and chemical weapons. Furthermore, the vast majority of speakers emphasized the importance of the relationship between disarmament and development. Although the thirty-ninth session opened in a climate of uncertainty, which increased the fear of nuclear confrontation, the debate which we had on disarmament during this session proceeded in a less tense atmosphere than that which prevailed last year, undoubtedly because there was some hope for an improvement in international relations, particularly with respect to the two super-Powers, as indicated by the bilateral negotiations which are to be held on 7 and 8 January at Geneva. However, the concerns and anxieties expressed by most of those speakers over the continuing arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race between the two major Powers, brought out the fact that no effort should be spared to keep the situation from deteriorating and to ensure that the situation will be reversed.

313. During the work of the Committee the delegations introduced 71 draft resolutions and a draft decision on various disarmament items. In this connection, the Committee organized its work to facilitate the adoption of these draft resolutions. The Committee considered 71 draft resolutions and the draft decision before it. Seven of them were not put to a vote. The consideration of one draft resolution was adjourned under rule 116 of the rules of procedure. The Committee therefore adopted at this session 18 draft resolutions on disarmament matters without voting on them and 45 draft resolutions as well as a draft decision by a recorded vote, which amounts to a total of 63 draft resolutions and one draft decision. We can thus see that this figure is somewhat higher than the number of draft resolutions adopted last year. Of the 63 draft resolutions adopted, 26 dealt with the question of nuclear disarmament, including the prevention of nuclear war, a nuclear-weapons-test ban, bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons, a nuclear-weapons freeze and security safeguards for non-nuclear-weapons States, as well as nuclear-weapon-free zones. The draft decision dealt with the question of deterrence. The number of draft resolutions dealing with the subject indicates the importance which attaches to matters related to nuclear armament.

314. Regarding other disarmament matters which are also of very great importance, the Committee adopted four draft resolutions on chemical weapons, three on conventional weapons, including the naval arms race, one draft resolution dealing with the prevention of an arms race in outer space and 29 draft resolutions on all other matters, including the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission, the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, the World Disarmament Conference, a certain number of studies covering various disarmament issues, the relation between disarmament and development and the reduction of military budgets, as well as the World Disarmament Campaign and Disarmament Week.

315. The reports of the First Committee which you have before you give details about the action taken on each of the agenda items, as well as the results of

the votes on the various draft resolutions which were adopted. It is not my intention to take up too much of the little time available to the General Assembly by presenting detailed comments on all of these reports. Nevertheless, I would simply like to emphasize that among these reports there are three which cover a number of subsidiary items which were the subject of several draft resolutions, particularly agenda item 59 on review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, comprising 12 sub-items that were the subject of 19 draft resolutions; agenda item 60 on review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly, comprising eight sub-items, which gave rise to 11 draft resolutions; and agenda item 65 on general and complete disarmament, comprising eight sub-items, which were the subject of 10 draft resolutions.

316. In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that the Committee carried out constructive consideration of all disarmament matters, which covered a wide range of international issues. Deliberations in recent weeks in the First Committee have clearly indicated that there is a general consensus that the United Nations should play a central role and bears prime responsibility in the field of disarmament. In this context it is encouraging to note that delegations have undertaken to work unswervingly towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The decisions they took on various disarmament items before the Committee indicated that it was their genuine desire to seek practical, effective ways and measures to preserve and promote international peace and security.

317. With these brief comments, I have the honour to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolutions contained in the reports of the First Committee.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.

318. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote.

319. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

320. May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

May I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

321. We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 45 [*A/39/735*]. I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda,[9] Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belize, Cuba, France, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mali.

The draft resolution was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 39/51).

322. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 46 [*A/39/736*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua

New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France,[10] United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, China, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Spain, Turkey.

The draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to 3, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/52).

323. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to explain his vote.

324. Mr. GARCÍA ITURBE (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted but wishes to state for the record that that does not affect Cuba's position regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is mentioned therein.

325. The PRESIDENT: The next report of the First Committee is on agenda item 47 [*A/39/737*]. I invite the Assembly to turn its attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

326. I call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

327. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): The statement made this afternoon by the Secretary-General is a further indication of his personal concern at the escalating arms race, a concern which my delegation deeply shares. Permit me therefore to preface my intervention with this observation.

328. Two events, as the Secretary-General mentioned in his statement, that have taken place in the last six years are emphasized in two different ways. As regards the universal consensus on disarmament, at the first special session devoted to disarmament, in 1978, representatives of all Member States adopted by consensus the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*], which remains on record as the closest thing to a blueprint for disarmament ever adopted. A second special session devoted to disarmament, in 1982, which was to have consolidated the achievements of the first special session, failed, but that special session can best be remembered as providing the opportunity for the unprecedented march for peace on 12 June 1982, in which about three quarters of a million people from all over the world participated. This was a clear demonstration of the fervent desire of the ordinary man and woman that Governments should act before it is too late. Instead of improving, however, the situation has grown worse.

329. The General Assembly, of course, has not been remiss in its duty of adopting resolutions that emphasize areas for urgent action. However, the nuclear-weapon States have simply ignored these resolutions and persisted in their resolve not only to refine nuclear weapons to unimaginable limits but to extend the arms race to an environment hitherto considered fictional.

330. In the conventional weapons age which saw the birth of this Organization, disarmament was desirable to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. In the nuclear age in which we now live, disarmament is an absolute necessity to save mankind from total extinction.

331. The present level of sophistication of nuclear weaponry has brought mankind to a period in which the next war will be one of machine against man, and it is one which man is bound to lose. Man's own creation of nuclear weaponry accumulated by the two super-Powers will, if launched in a war between them, kill perhaps half of humanity in its direct and immediate impact, but, more than that, it will create what has been called a nuclear winter, which will certainly finish the other half. This is not the imagination of alarmists or idealists; it is the finding of eminent scientists.

332. Thanks to the study whose result has been popularized by Mr. Carl Sagan, we now know that obscuring dust, and especially the dark soot which is one of the four known environmental consequences of the nuclear war, will absorb ordinary visible light from the sun, heating the atmosphere and cooling the earth's surface. Severe and prolonged low temperatures—the nuclear winter—would follow a nuclear war. For the first time it has been shown that the effects of such a war would not be restricted to the northern hemisphere where the nuclear exchange would mainly take place. Fine particles would be transported across the equator, bringing cold and darkness to the southern hemisphere. Therefore, the more we know about the consequences of nuclear war, the greater is our fear, if not panic.

333. We are about to adopt a series of draft resolutions which again signify that fear. However, we are painfully aware also that the key to progress is with the two super-Powers, and their perception of each other is a major obstacle to that progress. We therefore hope that the forthcoming negotiations, which are due to commence in January, will be undertaken in a changed atmosphere.

334. The attitude to multilateral negotiations, we believe, must also change. It is most unfortunate that the single multilateral negotiating forum which emerged out of the first special session on disarmament has not been enabled to carry out serious negotiations. There seems to be a certain distrust of the Conference on Disarmament by certain nuclear-weapon States. That distrust is leading to the paralysis of that body.

335. Turning now to the draft resolutions in document A/39/737, my delegation attaches very great importance to the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. It is regrettable that, although this subject is one of the most thoroughly studied, it has not been possible for the multilateral negotiating body to undertake concrete negotiations on it. This is a result of the distrust that I have just mentioned, a distrust of the multilateral negotiating body. At the same time during which there has been no negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament, the trilateral negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have not been resumed since 1980. The crucial role of a comprehensive test ban in an effective non-proliferation régime cannot be over-emphasized. The impend-

ing Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons obliges the nuclear-weapon States parties to show their determination to fulfil their undertakings under that Treaty. My delegation hopes that a step in this direction will be demonstrated by a consensus in the Conference on Disarmament on the initiation at its next session of multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Such a consensus will of course imply the agreement of those nuclear-weapon States not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

336. With this hope in mind, my delegation will support all the draft resolutions on a nuclear test ban recommended by the First Committee, and this includes the draft resolution in document A/39/737. However, our affirmative vote on that draft resolution—which is a change from our abstention in the First Committee—is not to be construed as endorsement of paragraph 4 of that draft resolution.

337. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report [*A/39/737*]. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. If there is no objection, I shall first put to the vote paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was adopted by 80 votes to 19, with 41 abstentions.

338. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/53).

339. The PRESIDENT: The next report of the First Committee is on agenda item 48 [*A/39/738*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/54).

340. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 49 [*A/39/739*]. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab

Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 100 votes to 3, with 42 abstentions (resolution 39/55).

341. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 50 [*A/39/740*]. The draft resolution recommended by the First Committee appears in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/56).

342. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 51 [*A/39/741*]. May I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, China, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Honduras, India, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 104 votes to 19, with 20 abstentions (resolution 39/57).[11]

343. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 52 [*A/39/742*]. I invite members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, India, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 146 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 39/58).

344. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 54 [*A/39/744*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 13 of its report. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 8. If there is no

objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote first. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 8 of the draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

345. The **PRESIDENT**: I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 150 votes to none, with one abstention (resolution 39/59).

346. The **PRESIDENT**: We shall now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 56 [*A/39/746*]. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/60).

347. The **PRESIDENT**: Next we turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 57

[*A/39/747*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. Draft resolution A is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 147 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/61 A).

348. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote draft resolution B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 137 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions (resolution 39/61 B).

349. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Albania for an explanation of vote.

350. Mr. JANKU (Albania): The Albanian delegation did not participate in the voting on numerous resolutions recommended by the First Committee regarding various disarmament problems. At the same time, I should like to put on record that although my delegation dissociated itself from the consensus when these resolutions were so adopted, it did not mean that my country is against disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security. On the contrary, our position in this respect is just and crystal clear; it has been expressed in our statements in the General Assembly or the appropriate committee.

351. We share the concern and join our voice to the appeal of peace-loving peoples and countries for peace, international security and genuine disarmament. However, by taking this opportunity, the Albanian delegation wishes once again to reiterate its reservations with regard to these resolutions.

352. As on previous occasions, we maintain that it is the two super-Powers—American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism—which, in pursuit of their aggressive and hegemonistic policies, and ignoring the concern of world public opinion, as well as resolutions adopted by the United Nations and other international forums, are continuously intensifying the arms race, which has now extended to outer space. Nevertheless, we wish to point out that our delegation voted in favour of the draft resolutions in document A/39/747, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration" and "Nuclear capability of South Africa" and will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/39/743, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

353. As we have explained before, we reiterate now that our affirmative vote for those draft resolutions is in keeping with our determined position in support of the struggle of the African peoples against the racist régime of South Africa and the Arab peoples' struggle against the Israeli Zionists. However, we should like to stress that our support for these draft resolutions does not affect our well-known and

principled attitude as regards the establishment of so-called zones of peace, or nuclear-weapon-free zones.

354. The PRESIDENT: We come now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 58 [*A/39/748*]. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/62).

355. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 60 [*A/39/750*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the eleven draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 30 of its report. Draft resolution A is entitled "World Disarmament Campaign: actions and activities". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 31 abstentions (resolution 39/63 A).[12]

356. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution B without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 39/63 B).

357. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C is entitled "Nuclear arms freeze". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, China, Iceland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Lucia, Spain.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 129 votes to 12, with 8 abstentions (resolution 39/63 C).

358. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D is entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Rwanda, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/63 D).

359. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E is entitled "Consideration of Guidelines for Confidence-Building Measures". The First Committee adopted draft resolution E without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution E was adopted (resolution 39/63 E).

360. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Regional Disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution F without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution F was adopted (resolution 39/63 F).

361. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution G is entitled "Freeze on Nuclear Weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, China, Guyana, Iceland, Israel,[13] Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Lucia, Spain.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 127 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions (resolution 39/63 G).

362. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H is entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan.

Draft resolution H was adopted by 128 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/63 H).

363. The **PRESIDENT**: Draft resolution I is entitled "Convening of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/63 I).

364. The **PRESIDENT**: Draft resolution J concerns the World Disarmament Campaign. The First Committee adopted draft resolution J without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution J was adopted (resolution 39/63 J).

365. The **PRESIDENT**: Finally, we turn to draft resolution K, which is entitled "Disarmament and international security". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of),[14] Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution K was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 19 abstentions (resolution 39/63 K).[12]

366. The **PRESIDENT**: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 61 [*A/39/751*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The Committee adopted draft resolution A without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 39/64 A).

367. The **PRESIDENT**: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of),[14] Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel,[15] Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, China, India, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 114 votes to 16, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/64 B).

368. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of Botswana, who wishes to explain her vote.

369. Ms. MOSELE (Botswana): My delegation voted positively on resolution B in document A/39/751, but it would like to reserve its position on paragraph 3.

370. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 64 [*A/39/754*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the five draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 21 of its report. I shall first put to the vote draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas,[16] Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, India, Madagascar, Mexico, Nicaragua, Romania, Yugoslavia.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 118 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions (resolution 39/65 A).[15]

371. The PRESIDENT: Next, we turn to draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 84 votes to 1, with 62 abstentions (resolution 39/65 B).[12]

372. The PRESIDENT: The First Committee adopted draft resolution C without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 39/65 C).

373. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution D. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 39/65 D).

374. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution E. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cape Verde, Chile, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of),[17] Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mexico, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 87 votes to 18, with 30 abstentions (resolution 39/65 E).[15,18]

375. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Democratic Kampuchea, who wishes to explain his vote after the vote.

376. Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution B. My delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution, for the following reasons. Most people believe that the use of chemical warfare began and ended in the fields of Europe in the First World War, with monstrously gassed boys dying in the trenches. The deaths of the troops eased up, but the development of chemical warfare has never stopped. The capability of chemical weapons to bring sickness, death and destruction has in fact grown to levels never before thought possible. As a result we are now on the threshold of the age of chemical weapons.

377. During the past few years chemical weapons have still been widely used on hot battlefields in various areas of the world, for instance, in Afghanistan, Laos and my country, Kampuchea. Since December 1978, as a result of the Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea, many hundreds of thousands of Kampucheans have died in massacres committed by the enemy or as a result of famine deliberately spread or chemical and biological weapons used by the invading forces.

378. These crimes of genocide, perpetrated by means of the systematic, widespread and indiscriminate use of chemical weapons against the Kampuchean people, show still more clearly, first, the barbaric nature of the present war of aggression against Kampuchea; secondly, the policy of genocide being pursued by the aggressor against the Kampuchean people; and, thirdly, the total impasse into which the aggressor has been driven by the increasingly powerful struggle of the people and the national resistance forces of Kampuchea. The aggressors in Kampuchea have intensified their use of chemical weapons to make up for their shortage of troops in Kampuchea or to reinforce their troops, who are overcome by defeatism and demoralization and who are about to suffer their final defeat on the battlefield of Kampuchea.

379. As the people of Kampuchea have been victims of the use of chemical and biological weapons, my delegation wishes more than anyone else to see the earliest possible adoption of the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. In this regard, we should like to reiterate our profound gratitude to all friendly countries which have shown their sympathy for the plight of the Kampuchean people and which have been making serious and sincere efforts towards the adoption of the convention. However, among the list of sponsors of the draft we find the name of the country which has more than 200,000 troops occupying Kampuchea and resorting to barbaric chemical warfare against the people of Kampuchea.

380. The Assembly is aware of the number of times the authorities of that country have used the Organization as a platform to slander the international community, to justify their acts of aggression and to attack other peace-loving countries throughout the world. They continue to this day to defy the insistent appeals of the international community, which has asked them to withdraw their troops from Kampuchea and to allow the Kampuchean people to decide their own destiny without any foreign interference.

381. We cannot but view this sponsorship as part and parcel of the diplomatic manoeuvres which are constantly used by those authorities to show that they are the champions of peace and thus to justify their invasion and occupation of Kampuchea, to induce the international community to tolerate the crimes they have committed and are still committing against the people of Kampuchea and to assist in a *fait accompli* in Kampuchea.

382. The presence of that country among the sponsors of the draft resolution we have just adopted is not only an insult to the peace-loving and justice-loving countries which have given sincerely of their time and their energy to ensure the triumph of right and justice but also an insult to the memory of those who have perished and those who are still struggling for their national liberation. It is not by becoming a sponsor of this draft but rather by putting an end to its war of aggression in Kampuchea and an end to the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons against the Kampuchean people that Viet Nam can contribute positively to the early adoption of the convention.

383. My delegation would like to enter very serious reservations on this score and to request that they appear in the records of the General Assembly.

384. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 142 [*A/39/760*]. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of this report?

It was so decided (decision 39/415).

The meeting rose at 9.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[3] See paragraph 232 of the present meeting.

[4] The delegation of the Sudan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had not intended to participate in the vote on the amendment.

[5] The delegation of Senegal subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the amendment.

[6] The delegation of Malaysia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the amendment.

[7] The delegation of Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[8] See A/40/87, annex, resolution AHG/Res.125 (XX).

[9] The delegation of Rwanda subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[10] The delegation of France subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[11] The delegation of Haiti subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[12] The delegation of Israel subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[13] The delegation of Israel subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

[14] The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had not intended to participate in the vote.

[15] The delegation of Israel subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[16] The delegation of the Bahamas subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[17] The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[18] The delegation of Angola subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

98th PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 13 December 1984, at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):[*]

(*a*) Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

(*b*) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions;

(*c*) Appointment of a member of the Board of Auditors;

(*d*) Confirmation of the appointment of members of the Investments Committee;

(*e*) Appointment of members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal;

(*f*) International Civil Service Commission:

(i) Appointment of members of the Commission;

(ii) Designation of the Vice-Chairman of the Commission

AGENDA ITEM 108

Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors:

(*a*) United Nations;

(*b*) United Nations Development Programme;

(*c*) United Nations Children's Fund;

(*d*) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;

(*e*) United Nations Institute for Training and Research;

(*f*) Voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

(*g*) Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme;

(*h*) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;

(*i*) United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation;

(*j*) United Nations Industrial Development Fund

AGENDA ITEM 114

Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences

AGENDA ITEM 117

United Nations common system (*concluded*):[**]

(*a*) Report of the International Civil Service Commission;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 119

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (*concluded*):[**]

(*b*) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran) (Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee): Today I have the honour to introduce ten separate reports of the Fifth Committee. The first six of these deal with agenda item 17 (*a*) to (*f*), concerning appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments.

2. The report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item 17 (*a*), concerning the appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, is contained in document

---

[*] Resumed from the 93rd meeting.

[**] Resumed from the 81st meeting.

A/39/725. The recommendation of the Committee appears in paragraph 6 of the report.

3. The next report relates to sub-item 17 (*b*), concerning the appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions, and is contained in document A/39/726. The Committee's recommendation appears in paragraph 5 of the report.

4. The third report relates to sub-item 17 (*c*), concerning the appointment of a member of the Board of Auditors, and is contained in document A/39/727. The Committee's recommendation is in paragraph 5 of the report.

5. The fourth report of this series relates to sub-item 17 (*d*), concerning the confirmation of the appointment of members of the Investments Committee, and is contained in document A/39/728. The recommendation of the Committee appears in paragraph 4 of the report.

6. Next, I wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the report of the Fifth Committee which relates to sub-item 17 (*e*), dealing with the appointment of members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, and is contained in document A/39/729. The Committee's recommendation appears in paragraph 4 of the report.

7. Finally, as regards appointments, I submit for consideration by the General Assembly the Fifth Committee's report on sub-item 17 (*f*), concerning the appointment of members of the International Civil Service Commission and the designation of the Vice-Chairman of the Commission; the report is contained in document A/39/820. The recommendation of the Committee appears in paragraph 11 of the report.

8. Allow me now to call the attention of the General Assembly to the report of the Fifth Committee which deals with agenda item 108, concerning the financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors. The report is contained in document A/39/618 and the recommendations of the Fifth Committee appear in paragraphs 12 and 13. In paragraph 12, the Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions, I and II. Draft resolution I concerns the financial reports and audited financial statements and reports of the Board of Auditors, while draft resolution II deals with the catering operation at United Nations Headquarters. Paragraph 13 of the Committee's report contains the text of a draft decision recommended by the Committee on the subject of the Internal Audit Division.

9. The two draft resolutions and the draft decision recommended were adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote.

10. The Fifth Committee's report on agenda item 114, concerning the pattern of conferences, appears in document A/39/730. Paragraph 9 of this report contains four draft resolutions, A to D, which the Committee recommends to the Assembly for adoption. These deal, respectively, with the report of the Committee on Conferences, the shortening of sessions or adoption of a biennial cycle for sessions of United Nations organs, the pattern of conferences and the control and limitation of documentation. The four draft resolutions were adopted by the Committee without a vote.

11. The next report which I have the honour to introduce comprises part II of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 117, concerning the United Nations common system. The report appears in document A/39/718/Add.1 and contains, in paragraphs 9 and 10, the recommendations of the Fifth Committee in the form of a draft resolution and a draft decision which were adopted by the Committee without a vote.

12. I come now to the last report of the Fifth Committee to be considered by the General Assembly at this meeting. I refer to the report on agenda item 119 (*b*), concerning the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. The report appears in document A/39/767 and contains, in paragraph 9, the recommendation of the Fifth Committee in the form of three draft resolutions, I and II A and B.

13. Draft resolution I concerns the review of the rates of reimbursement to the Governments of troop-contributing States. It was adopted by the Fifth Committee by a recorded vote of 89 to 11, with 5 abstentions.

14. Draft resolutions II A and B concern the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. They were adopted by the Fifth Committee by a recorded vote of 88 to 12, with 3 abstentions.

15. I have the honour, on behalf of the Fifth Committee, to recommend to the General Assembly for approval the various reports to which I have referred.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fifth Committee.

16. The **PRESIDENT**: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fifth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant summary records.

17. May I remind the members of the Assembly that in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401 the General Assembly decided that when the same draft resolution was considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting was different from its vote in the committee. May I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

18. I first invite the members of the General Assembly to turn their attention to the report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item 17 (*a*) [*A/39/725*].

19. The Fifth Committee, in paragraph 6 of its report, recommends to the General Assembly the appointment of Mr. Even Fontaine-Ortiz, Mr. Jobst Holborn, Mrs. Virginia Housholder, Mr. Igor Vasilevich Khalevinski and Mr. Rachid Lahlou as members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985. May I take it that the Assembly adopts this recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 39/317).

20. The **PRESIDENT**: We come now to the report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item 17 (*b*) [*A/39/726*]. In paragraph 5 of this report, the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the appointment of Mr. Amjad Ali, Mr. Ernesto Battisti, Mr. Javier Castillo Ayala, Mr. Anatoly

Semënovich Chistyakov, Mr. Dominique Souchet and Mr. Wang Liansheng as members of the Committee on Contributions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985, and the appointment of Mr. Yasuo Noguchi as a member of the Committee for a one-year term beginning on 1 January 1985. May I take it that the Assembly adopts this recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 39/318).

21. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the members of the General Assembly to turn their attention to the report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item 17 (*c*) [*A/39/727*]. In paragraph 5 of this report the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the appointment of the Auditor-General of Ghana as a member of the Board of Auditors for a three-year term beginning on 1 July 1985. May I take it that the Assembly adopts this recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 39/319).

22. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the members of the General Assembly to turn their attention to the report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item 17 (*d*) [*A/39/728*]. The Fifth Committee, in paragraph 4 of the report, recommends to the General Assembly the confirmation of the appointment by the Secretary-General of Mr. Jean Guyot, Mr. George Johnston and Mr. Michiya Matsukawa as members of the Investments Committee for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985. May I take it that the Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 39/320).

23. The PRESIDENT: We come now to the report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item 17 (*e*) [*A/39/729*]. In paragraph 4 of the report the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the appointment of Mr. Luis Maria de Posadas Montero and Mr. Endre Ustor as members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1985. May I consider that the Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 39/321).

24. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we turn to the report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item 17 (*f*) [*A/39/820*].

25. In paragraph 11 of the report, the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the appointment of Mr. Amjad Ali, Mr. Michael O. Ani, Mr. Omar Sirry, Mr. Valery Vasilyevich Tsybukov and Mr. M. A. Vellodi as members of the International Civil Service Commission for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1985; and the appointment of Mr. Carlos S. Vegega as a member of the Commission for a two-year term beginning on 1 January 1985. Furthermore, the Fifth Committee recommends to the Assembly the designation of Mr. Carlos S. Vegega as Vice-Chairman of the Commission for a two-year term beginning on 1 January 1985. May I take it that the Assembly approves these recommendations?

It was so decided (decision 39/322).

26. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 108 [*A/39/618*].

27. The General Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendations of the Fifth Committee contained in paragraphs 12 and 13 of its report. In paragraph 12 the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions, I and II. Draft resolution I is entitled "Financial reports and audited financial statements and reports of the Board of Auditors".

28. The Fifth Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/66).

29. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Catering operation at United Nations Headquarters", was also adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/67).

30. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 13 of the report, the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft decision entitled "Internal Audit Division". The Committee adopted that draft decision without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/416).

31. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 114 [*A/39/730*].

32. The Assembly will take a decision on draft resolutions A to D recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 9 of its report, under the general title "Pattern of Conferences". Draft resolution A is entitled "Report of the Committee on Conferences". May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 39/68 A).

33. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B, entitled "Shortening of sessions or adoption of a biennial cycle for sessions of United Nations organs", was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution B?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 39/68 B).

34. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C is entitled "Pattern of conferences". The Fifth Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 39/68 C).

35. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D is entitled "Control and limitation of documentation". It was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution D?

Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 39/68 D).

36. The PRESIDENT: We will now consider part II [*A/39/718/Add.1*] of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 117.

37. The General Assembly will first take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 9 of the report. That draft resolution is entitled "United Nations common system: report of the International Civil Service Commission (Chaps. IV-IX)" and was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/69).

38. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 10 of the report, the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft decision entitled "Statute of the International Civil Service Commission". The Fifth Committee adopted that draft decision without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to do likewise?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/417).

39. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, who has asked to make a statement.

40. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Under this agenda item the Soviet delegation believes it necessary to state its views on the demonstration by the so-called Staff Union that took place yesterday morning while the General Assembly was working intensively.

41. We view these actions, whatever words are used to describe them, as an attempt by the Staff Union to place itself above Member States and an open defiance of States. In essence, the international civil servants have challenged the right of States to resolve all matters relating to the staff of international organizations, including questions of remuneration. This approach runs counter to the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolutions.

42. The Soviet delegation would stress that the Staff Union has no right to place itself above Member States and to challenge decisions adopted by main bodies of the United Nations. We should like to express our categorical objection to attempts by the Staff Union to turn itself into a political body and to exert pressure on Member States and intergovernmental bodies during their consideration of matters related to staff, in particular remuneration.

43. The delegation of the USSR describes these actions by the Staff Union as illegitimate and prejudicial to the work of the Organization and the United Nations system.

44. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 119 (*b*) [*A/39/767*].

45. I call on the representative of Albania, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

46. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): The Albanian delegation will vote against the draft resolutions on the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon which appear in document A/39/767 and which the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption. We should like to reiterate that our negative vote is in conformity with the position always taken by us in votes taken on the financing and dispatching of different United Nations forces to various parts and regions. The Albanian delegation has always clearly explained its attitude before the General Assembly or in the Fifth Committee and will not now repeat it in detail.

47. The PRESIDENT: The recommendations of the Fifth Committee are contained in paragraph 9 of its report in the form of three draft resolutions, I and II A and B.

48. First I put to the vote draft resolution I entitled "Review of the rates of reimbursement to the Governments of troop-contributing States". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Benin, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Maldives, Romania, Yemen.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 119 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions (resolution 39/70).[1]

49. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolutions II A and B grouped under the general title "Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Iraq, Maldives, Yemen.

Draft resolutions II A and B were adopted by 121 votes to 15, with 3 abstentions (resolutions 39/71 A and B).[2]

AGENDA ITEM 31

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*):*

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid;*

(*b*) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

(*c*) Report of the Secretary-General

50. The PRESIDENT: I shall call first on those representatives who wish to introduce the draft resolutions.

31. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria), Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*: I have the honour to introduce the first two draft resolutions on the item. Draft resolution A/39/L.28, entitled "Comprehensive sanctions against the *apartheid* regime and support to the liberation struggle in South Africa", is sponsored by 31 countries.

52. Draft resolution A/39/L.29, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *apartheid*", is sponsored by 44 countries.

53. Draft resolution A/39/L.28 is essentially a restatement of the firm commitment of the United Nations to the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa and of its concern for the oppressed majority in that country, and a reaffirmation of the call for the isolation of the criminal racist régime and of full support for the oppressed people and their national liberation movements in their legitimate struggle for a non-racial democratic society. It is based on resolutions adopted by the General Assembly by overwhelming majorities in past years.

54. The draft resolution takes into account the grave aggravation of the situation in South Africa, resulting from the imposition by the racist régime of a constitution designed to entrench *apartheid* and dispossess the indigenous African people, who constitute 73 per cent of the population; the escalation of repression by that régime and its killing of innocent men, women and children; and the growing resistance by the people against all manifestations of *apartheid*.

55. It is a call to the international community to respond to the inescapable moral challenge posed by *apartheid*, a renewed request to the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, and an appeal to the major Western Powers to desist from protecting the racist régime and to facilitate comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against it. It is a rejection of the propaganda and actions of the collaborators with *apartheid*, who seek to bestow respectability on the despicable racist régime in Pretoria, and a recognition of the need for more effective action to destroy *apartheid*.

Mr. Helgason (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

56. I will not refer to all the provisions of the draft resolution, as they are clear and simple, but will only draw special attention to some paragraphs which relate to developments in the past year.

57. For instance, in the fourth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 2, the draft resolution refers to the declarations of four important conferences organized by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in its untiring efforts to promote action by all Governments and organizations for the elimination of *apartheid*.

58. In the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 3, the draft resolution draws attention to the escalation of repression and violence by the racist régime, which has even deployed armed forces against African townships and indiscriminately murdered many men, women and children.

59. In the sixth and nineteenth preambular paragraphs the draft resolution condemns the so-called new constitution, rejected by the great majority of the people of South Africa. The General Assembly and the Security Council have indeed already denounced that constitution, and declared it null and void. The present régime in South Africa, emerging from the obnoxious constitution, can therefore be accorded no recognition whatsoever.

60. Consequently, in paragraphs 10, 12 and 29, the draft resolution calls for the exclusion of that régime from the United Nations and its specialized agencies and for the denial of any legitimacy to that régime by any State.

61. While deploring and condemning the growing collaboration of certain Western States and Israel with the *apartheid* régime, despite repeated appeals by the General Assembly, the draft resolution expresses grave anxiety, in particular, over the increased collaboration by the Government of the United States of America in pursuance of its policy of so-called "constructive engagement". It condemns that policy in paragraph 15, and in paragraph 18 it appeals to all Governments and organizations to exert their influence to persuade the United States Government, and others concerned, to co-operate in international action for the elimination of *apartheid*.

62. On the other hand, the draft resolution commends Governments and organizations, cities and local authorities, and the numerous individuals who have contributed to the international campaign against *apartheid*, often at great sacrifice.

63. The purpose of the draft resolution is to ensure maximum pressure on the *apartheid* régime, to promote all appropriate assistance to the oppressed people and their national liberation movements in their legitimate struggle for a non-racial, democratic society and to mobilize world opinion in support of United Nations action for the elimination of *apartheid*. To that end it lays down guidelines for concrete

---

*Resumed from the 71st meeting.

and effective action by the Security Council, by Member States, by intergovernmental organizations, by non-governmental organizations and by individuals.

64. While we regard the provisions of this draft resolution as the minimum action required of the international community to discharge its inescapable moral responsibility, I am aware that they are regarded by some delegations as controversial. Some Western States which are basically supportive of the international efforts against *apartheid* have found it difficult to accept some of the formulations. We shall continue patiently to explain our views and to try, we hope, to persuade them.

65. A few delegations, however, are opposed to the thrust of this draft resolution because they are anxious to continue and to expand collaboration with the *apartheid* régime. They advocate a so-called consensus text which would involve no action against *apartheid*, except for verbal condemnations. We cannot accept any such consensus, which not only would be meaningless but would be a betrayal of our responsibility to the millions of people struggling for the principles of the United Nations.

66. We see no merit whatsoever in the argument that a request for effective action against *apartheid* by all organizations and institutions within the United Nations system is inappropriate for the reason that it "politicizes" specialized institutions. *Apartheid* is universally recognized as a crime, a negation of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations and its family of agencies. We cannot, therefore, see how action against the crime of *apartheid* constitutes "politicization" of the agencies.

67. In this connection, I wish to inform the Assembly that I have received assurances from the IAEA that South Africa is no longer a member of any IAEA technical working groups. In the light of those assurances, the Assembly may wish to omit from draft resolution A/39/L.28 the last part of paragraph 31, which reads: "and, in particular, to exclude South Africa from all its technical working groups".

68. We cannot accept the argument that the exclusion of the Pretoria régime violates the principle of universality of the United Nations. That régime, resulting from a constitution denounced by the Security Council and the General Assembly as null and void, has no legitimacy whatsoever, and is rejected by the great majority of the people of South Africa. Acceptance of that régime as the voice of South Africa would be repugnant to the principle of universality.

69. I am aware also that some delegations express opposition to the recognition of the right of the oppressed people of South Africa to engage in armed struggle for liberation. Many of those delegations represent countries which attained their own independence by armed struggle and which, indeed, resorted to armed struggle against Nazi oppression. How, then, can they deny the right of armed struggle to the black majority in South Africa when the racist régime is resorting not only to arbitrary and ruthless repression but also to indiscriminate killings and massacres? We have pleaded again and again for a peaceful and just solution, and the General Assembly has on numerous occasions called for sanctions against the *apartheid* régime as the only effective means towards that end. When United Nations action is paralysed by the intransigence of some Powers and when the *apartheid* régime has escalated its violence, what other alternatives do the oppressed people have than to struggle by all available means?

70. We must place the blame for violence and conflict where it belongs—that is, on the *apartheid* régime—and press for effective sanctions against that régime as the only way to minimize that violence and eliminate that conflict.

71. Finally, some delegations express opposition to the naming of some countries which are sustaining the *apartheid* régime. In this connection, I should like to refer to the amendments proposed by the United States of America. It gives me no pleasure to express distress at the policies of the United States, with which my country, Nigeria, maintains, and seeks to maintain, friendly relations. But when we deal with the great moral challenge of *apartheid*, which affects the honour and dignity of the continent of Africa, we feel duty-bound to speak the truth without fear or favour.

72. The policy of so-called "constructive engagement" is diametrically opposed to the repeated appeals of this Assembly. It means more collaboration with the *apartheid* régime instead of sanctions against it. It means hostility to the national liberation movements instead of support for them. It means propaganda for inaction on the issue of *apartheid*.

73. Who can deny that this misguided policy of constructive engagement pursued by a great Power has encouraged the *apartheid* régime and thereby caused immense suffering to the black people in South Africa? The *apartheid* régime has expressed great satisfaction at that policy, while the oppressed majority has described it, in the words of Bishop Tutu, as immoral, evil and an unmitigated disaster for the black people.

74. We are encouraged that the conscience of the United States has been outraged by the fruits of that policy and that calls for meaningful action have come from leaders of both political parties and from churches, trade unions and other segments of society. I was gratified that the President of that great country has in the past few days condemned *apartheid* as repugnant. But even as he was speaking on Human Rights Day, the *apartheid* régime was charging six patriots with treason. Let me say that treason against a racist régime is not only an honour but a duty for African patriots, and we cannot stand idly by when the racists seek to sentence them to death.

75. The United States is a great Power and a leader of an alliance. It can make a crucial contribution to the elimination of *apartheid*. In his statement last month to the General Assembly, the representative of the United States said: "We in the United States have asked ourselves what more we can do . . . to work towards greater justice and peace in southern Africa." [*69th meeting, para. 261.*]

76. Let me offer some suggestions for their benefit. First, the United States should abandon the outdated and discredited policy of constructive engagement; secondly, it should prevail on the South African régime to release Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and detainees; thirdly, it should prevail on the Botha régime to stop all forms of repression and political trials and instead embark on meaningful negotiations with the leaders of the oppressed people in South Africa; and lastly the United States should harmonize its policies with those of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United

Nations and join in the concerted action against *apartheid*. Only then can the obnoxious system of *apartheid* be eliminated. We are all waiting to see whether the United States Government will match President Reagan's words with action.

77. Members of the Special Committee have given very careful consideration to the amendments proposed by the United States of America in document A/39/L.43. We feel that a divisive vote on these amendments at this time, when the *apartheid* régime is escalating violence and oppression in South Africa, would be most unfortunate. With all due respect, therefore, I move, under rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that any debate on the United States amendments be adjourned and that the Assembly proceed to vote on the draft resolutions without delay.

78. Let me say from this rostrum that neither the Special Committee against *Apartheid* nor my country seeks confrontation with any Member State of the Organization. We seek consultations and dialogue with all Governments so that there can be effective and concerted action by the international community for the elimination of *apartheid*.

79. As Chairman of the Special Committee, I have had extensive consultations with a number of Western countries on a draft resolution to promote such action. I would like to express my great appreciation to the delegations concerned for their co-operation and commitment, and I hope that the draft resolution which will soon be introduced by my colleague, the representative of Sweden, will receive the widest support.

80. The second draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce, A/39/L.29, is on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. I need hardly persuade the members of the Assembly of the vital role played by the Special Committee in its constant efforts to inform world public opinion of the situation in South Africa and to promote action by Governments, organizations and individuals in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

81. I have had the honour to serve as Chairman of the Special Committee this year, and I wish to express my gratitude to all those delegations which have commended the work of the Special Committee at a difficult and critical time for southern Africa.

82. I trust that the draft resolutions will receive unanimous support.

83. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Barbados, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports, to introduce draft resolution A/39/L.31.

84. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados), Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports: On the behalf of its sponsors, including my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce to the Assembly draft resolution A/39/L.31, entitled "*Apartheid* in sports".

85. This draft resolution is aimed at extending the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports for another year, in order to permit the Committee to present the final draft to the General Assembly at its fortieth session. As is elaborated in the report of the Committee [*A/39/36*], progress has been achieved. This progress will I hope continue during the next year in order that the Committee may finalize its work.

86. The Committee intends to intensify further its contacts with Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with a view to overcoming any remaining obstacles.

87. The task before us is very important and deserves the support of the Assembly. The convention we are about to finalize will contribute to the international campaign to fight *apartheid* in sports and to ensure the isolation of the racist régime of South Africa from international sporting events. I sincerely hope that the Assembly will approve the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority.

88. My delegation submitted the amendment to this draft resolution, contained in document A/39/L.41. By that amendment the Assembly would request the Secretary-General to send the text of the revised draft convention and its amendments to all Member States for their comments and views. That proposal was contained in the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and it is considered important for the future work of the Committee. It is hoped that this amendment will be accepted and that comments will be submitted by 31 March 1985 in order to enable the Committee to conclude its work with dispatch.

89. Finally, next year we will celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations. We are looking forward to presenting the draft convention to the Assembly as a contribution to the struggle against *apartheid* and racism on that important occasion.

90. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to introduce draft resolution A/39/L.30.

91. Mr. SAIGNAVONGS (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the 32 delegations which sponsored it, including my own delegation, it is my honour to introduce to the Assembly draft resolution A/39/L.30, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa".

92. The collaboration between Israel and South Africa needs no further proof. In its report [*A/39/22/Add.1*] the Special Committee against *Apartheid* has stressed that that collaboration is constantly increasing and becoming more and more important in all fields, particularly the military and nuclear fields. This is very disturbing for neighbouring African countries, particularly the front-line States, in the light of the aggressive and hegemonistic nature of the racist régime of Pretoria.

93. The Special Committee has furthermore stressed that Israeli-South African relations are becoming closer and are extending to the bantustans, entities that the international community has rejected because they are merely instruments of the *apartheid* policy of Pretoria.

94. We all know that, despite United Nations decisions and almost unanimous condemnation by the international community, South Africa is persisting in its *apartheid* policies, continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and pursuing its aggressive policies against its neighbours.

95. Israel's collaboration, in addition to the collaboration of some Western countries, particularly the "constructive engagement" of the United States Government, which is linked with Israel by a strategic co-operation agreement, merely strengthens Pre-

toria's position and encourages it arrogantly to pursue its criminal *apartheid* policy and to persist in its intransigence.

96. At various international meetings and during the debate in plenary meetings of the General Assembly on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, an overwhelming majority of delegations have expressed their indignation about this collaboration and condemned it because it poses a threat to the peace and stability of southern Africa and to international peace and security. Therefore, in formulating this draft resolution, the sponsors have taken into account, on the one hand, the general feeling expressed during those deliberations and, on the other, ideas already accepted by the General Assembly last year in resolution 38/39 F.

97. In other words, the wording of this draft resolution is identical to that of resolution 38/39 F, except for the addition of the following two new points. First, the third preambular paragraph takes note of the declaration and resolutions of the Conference of Arab Solidarity with the Struggle for Liberation in Southern Africa, held at Tunis from 7 to 9 August 1984 [*A/39/450, annex*], in which more than 130 delegations from various countries and international organizations participated. Secondly, paragraph 1 states that the General Assembly commends the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for publicizing the growing relations between Israel and South Africa and promoting public awareness of the grave dangers of the alliance between those two countries as regards international peace and security.

98. The sponsors hope that the draft resolution, like that of last year, will be adopted by the General Assembly without difficulty and without any reservations.

99. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of India, who will introduce draft resolution A/39/L.32.

100. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): On behalf of the sponsors, I have the honour to introduce to the Assembly for consideration and adoption draft resolution A/39/L.32, entitled "Public information and public action against *apartheid*".

101. The first Prime Minister of India, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, stated in the Indian Parliament in 1958:

> "In South Africa, it is the deliberate, acknowledged and loudly proclaimed policy of the Government itself to maintain this segregation and racial discrimination. This makes South Africa's case unique in the world. It is a policy with which obviously no person and no country which believes in the Charter of the United Nations can ever compromise, because it uproots almost everything the modern world stands for and considers worthwhile, whether it is our ideas of democracy or human dignity."

102. That the policy of *apartheid* should persist in this day and age is, to most people, quite unthinkable. It is indeed incredible that a Government should continue, in spite of almost universal condemnation, to persist in the institutionalized practices of *apartheid*. Today, on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we are no nearer the objective declared decades ago to be rid of this evil. In fact attempts are being made further to entrench the *apartheid* system in South Africa, along with efforts to break the international isolation of South Africa. Rarely has oppression been so well organized or betrayal made to appear so respectable.

103. Information must be used effectively in the struggle against the *apartheid* régime to convince freedom-loving people all over the world that *apartheid* cannot be reformed; it must be ended. In this context, it is absolutely imperative that the international community be kept informed about developments in South Africa by continuously exposing the evil and cruelty of the *apartheid* régime and correspondingly ensuring concerted public action against the *apartheid* régime which would help and encourage all those who are struggling for freedom in South Africa.

104. The text of the draft resolution needs no elucidation. The international community is well aware that public information and public involvement can be used as a very effective means for the elimination of *apartheid*. In view of the enormous resources of the *apartheid* régime and its collaborators that are devoted to nefarious propaganda, it is essential that the Secretary-General take all appropriate steps to ensure full co-operation by the Department of Public Information, UNESCO and all United Nations offices and agencies with the Special Committee and the Centre against *Apartheid*. The Department of Public Information, in particular, should ensure the widest dissemination of information on the activities of and the crimes committed by the *apartheid* régime. There is an appeal to all Governments, information media, non-governmental organizations, trade unions, religious bodies, individuals, intellectuals, artists, athletes and public leaders to arouse the conscience of the world against *apartheid* and to intensify further the international campaign for the release of Nelson Mandela and all other South African political prisoners and detainees.

105. In order to strengthen the aforementioned efforts, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Centre against *Apartheid* are encouraged to intensify their activities designed to inform world public opinion of the situation in South Africa and promote public action in support of the just struggle of the oppressed people and the objectives of the United Nations. In order that this task may be carried out effectively, an appeal is made to all Governments to contribute generously to the Trust Fund for Publicity against *Apartheid* and to information activities of non-governmental organizations engaged in programmes against *apartheid*.

106. On behalf of the sponsors, including my own delegation, I express the sincere hope that the draft resolution will receive the unanimous support of all the delegations present here representing countries which cherish freedom, equality and human dignity.

107. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Denmark, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/39/L.33.

108. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): On behalf of the sponsors, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/39/L.33, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa".

109. The principal objective of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, which the General Assembly established in 1965, is to alleviate the suffering caused by the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa and to assist the victims of *apartheid*. The Fund is made up of voluntary contributions from States, organizations and individ-

uals. Since its inception, the Fund has been able to give assistance for the following purposes: first, legal assistance to persons persecuted under the repressive and discriminatory legislation of South Africa; secondly, relief to such persons and their dependants; thirdly, the education of such persons and their dependants; fourthly, relief for refugees from South Africa; and, fifthly, relief and assistance to persons persecuted under the repressive and discriminatory legislation in Namibia.

110. The fight against *apartheid* is one of the few issues on which the international community stands united. We are gravely concerned about the continued and increased repression against opponents of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa. Increased humanitarian assistance to those persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation is essential.

111. The international community has responded positively to the growing need for such assistance. However, there is a continuing need for contributions, and we would like to appeal to all Member States to contribute generously to the Fund. Furthermore, the sponsors hope that the General Assembly will again this year demonstrate its solidarity with the victims of *apartheid* by adopting this draft resolution unanimously.

112. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Sweden, who will introduce draft resolution A/39/L.36.

113. Mr. FERM (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/39/L.36, entitled "Concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid*", which is sponsored by 22 countries.

114. This is a new draft resolution on *apartheid*. During previous years my delegation had the honour to introduce a draft resolution on investments in South Africa. There is now urgent need for increased and effective pressure on South Africa. In this new draft resolution we call for such action against the background of a situation in South Africa of grave concern to us. We note in particular the recent killings, arbitrary arrests and detention of members of mass organizations opposing *apartheid*. We consider that the so-called reforms in South Africa have had the effect of further entrenching *apartheid*. We are convinced that the use of force by the South African authorities will lead to ever-increasing resistance by the oppressed people in South Africa and to increased tension, which will have far-reaching consequences for southern Africa and the world.

115. While in this resolution the Security Council is once again urged to consider without delay effective mandatory sanctions, the sponsors also appeal to all States, pending such action, to consider unilateral measures from an extensive range of options in such fields as investments, financial loans, trade promotion, military and nuclear collaboration. These would, in our opinion, be effective measures to bring about a peaceful solution.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

116. Furthermore, the sponsors wish to express their solidarity with all those who at great sacrifice legitimately struggle for a non-racial, democratic society and for lasting peace in South Africa. We consequently appeal for increased assistance to all those individuals, liberation movements and States that are the victims of the oppressive and aggressive policies of *apartheid*.

117. The draft resolution is the joint effort of primarily some African and Western Group States, including the five Nordic countries. The objective of our joint effort has been to present a draft resolution that addresses the wide spectrum of issues involved in the question of *apartheid* in South Africa. We have sought to approach this in a firm but at the same time constructive way. When formulating the operative part of the resolution, we have also been guided by the desire to ensure, in an unambiguous way, broad support from a wide range of countries for this draft resolution. Such broad support would be a clear signal to South Africa that the world community at large considers that the *apartheid* system has no place in today's world and that we are prepared to take concrete measures to bring about its abolishment.

118. The draft resolution now introduced should be seen as a new approach and as a concerted international effort to bring about an end to the *apartheid* system through peaceful means before that approach is too late. In this spirit, and against the background of a deteriorating situation in South Africa, we commend this draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly.

119. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to introduce amendments to draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and L.30.

120. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): Given the universally shared opposition of all Member States to *apartheid*, we deeply regret and strongly deplore the fact that again this year unfair, unjustified and hostile references to the United States are contained in the draft resolutions before us. We have proposed amendments to these texts to delete these references which violate long-established practices of the United Nations and which contravene the very spirit of concern for fair and just treatment that is the foundation of our common opposition to the unjust *apartheid* system.

121. The issue posed by the amendments we propose has nothing to do with the issue of justice in South Africa. It has everything to do with the issue of justice in the General Assembly. It has nothing to do with our common condemnation and abhorrence for the abusive treatment of black South Africans by the South African Government. It has everything to do with whether or not the Assembly means to encourage and perpetuate abusive treatment of individual Member States. The same sense of justice that fuels our outrage against the abuses of *apartheid* should be applied here in the relations among Member States. As justice should be for all in South Africa, so it must be for all in the General Assembly.

122. As we are unanimous in our view that injustice in South Africa must end, so we must be clear in our belief that justice in the international community begins here in the General Assembly, among these united nations. We appeal to all members of the General Assembly to let that simple sense of justice govern their actions today. We ask them to cast their votes in favour of our amendments. We ask them to vote against any manoeuvre that would deprive the General Assembly of an opportunity to declare its unequivocal support for basic fairness in its own proceedings and resolutions. We ask them to take a firm stand that will make clear to all the world that justice cannot be credibly preached unless all efforts

are made to assure that it is consistently practised here, now, in this body.

123. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Nigeria on a point of order.

124. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): Nigeria feels that a divisive vote on these amendments at this time, when we all know that the *apartheid* régime is escalating violence and repression in South Africa, would be most unfortunate.

125. I move that no action be taken at this time on the United States amendments and that the Assembly proceed to vote on the draft resolutions as presented.

126. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Nigeria has moved, in accordance with the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on the amendments submitted by the representative of the United States of America. Rule 74 reads:

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote."

127. In accordance with the motion proposed by Nigeria, if the motion is carried no further action will be taken by the Assembly with respect to the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.43 and L.44.

128. Does any representative wish to speak for or against the motion by Nigeria?

129. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): The United States delegation objects in the strongest possible terms to the motion to avoid discussion and vote on our amendments.

130. There are situations where it is undoubtedly in the interests of the Assembly not to take a decision on a particular subject, but there are clearly other situations in which this body has an interest in the consideration of a question.

131. We believe our amendments are proper subjects for discussion, debate and decision. They are not an attempt to solve long-standing disputes by indirect means, but instead are entirely germane to the proper consideration of the texts before us and to a proper affirmation of our fundamental principles and procedures.

132. In these circumstances, where the United States delegation has put forward directly relevant amendments in an effort to delete clear and hostile references to us, the effort to gag debate can be seen only as part and parcel of the same objectionable injustice which our amendments are meant to counter. Fundamental considerations of fairness should allow a country so mentioned and so abused to ask that the General Assembly declare itself on this matter.

133. We therefore hope that even those who prefer to see these draft resolutions remain as they are will be prepared to allow the Assembly its right to consider the question fully. In addition, we ask that a recorded vote be taken on this motion.

134. The PRESIDENT: Does any other representative wish to speak for or against the motion by Nigeria?

135. I see none. I now put to the vote the motion of the representative of Nigeria, that no action be taken on the amendments proposed by the representative of the United States of America. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cyprus, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela.

The motion was rejected by 56 votes to 50, with 28 abstentions.

136. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

137. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation's understanding is that the issue under consideration is *apartheid*. The resolutions against *apartheid* are so many, and there is only one reason for the sanctions against the régime of South Africa and that is *apartheid*.

138. *Apartheid* has rightly occupied the time of the Assembly for years, and the South African régime has been expelled from the General Assembly on the charge of *apartheid*. Therefore *apartheid*, to my understanding, is a very important issue, if not the most important issue of all.

139. It being the most important issue, on the basis of Article 18 of the Charter of the United Nations, my delegation requests a two-thirds majority, and I hope that this even-handedness will be maintained, because yesterday's issue was not any different from today's issue.

140. The PRESIDENT: Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter reads:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace

and security, the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council, the election of the members of the Economic and Social Council, the election of members of the Trusteeship Council in accordance with paragraph 1(*c*) of Article 86, the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members, questions relating to the operation of the trusteeship system, and budgetary questions."

141. Rule 85 of the General Assembly rules of procedure reads:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on questions other than those provided for in rule 83, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting."

142. I call on the representative of the United States of America to speak on a point of order.

143. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): The United States opposes, and opposes unequivocally and strongly, the proposal by the representative of Iran to require a two-thirds majority for the adoption of the United States amendments to the draft resolutions on *apartheid*. There is no provision in the rules of procedure that would call for any special majority for resolutions dealing with the subject of *apartheid*. The procedural situation is entirely different from that which the General Assembly considered yesterday [*97th meeting*] when it considered the Namibia resolutions and amendments. There is a special rule on the required Namibia resolutions, that is, that such resolutions and amendments require a two-thirds vote, but there is no special rule concerning resolutions on *apartheid*.

144. The only way that a special two-thirds majority could be required for *apartheid* texts is through such a motion as that which has been made by the Iranian delegation under Article 18, paragraph 3, of the Charter and rule 85 of the rules of procedure.

145. We vigorously oppose this motion. Such a motion could only have as its purpose an effort to deny the United States a fair vote on the United States amendments to these resolutions. Such a motion would be an abuse of the rules, for partisan and unfair objectives. None of the countries that might support such a motion has ever before suggested that anything other than a simple majority is needed to adopt *apartheid* resolutions or amendments thereto. The effort to invoke the "important question" technique has no justification in this case.

146. In addition, let me reiterate that, as I stated in introducing these amendments, the issue before us is not the issue of our common condemnation and abhorrence of *apartheid*. The issue before us is a fundamental issue of fairness to the United States, a fundamental issue of whether or not the General Assembly intends to affirm its basic treatment of the principles of fair and civil treatment in its deliberations.

147. We urge all members to join with us in voting against any motion to depart from the simple majority test that has traditionally been applied in these instances.

148. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to speak on a point of order.

149. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I just want to correct a very, very small—let us say, mistake—on the part of the representative of the United States. The issue is not fairness to the United States; the issue is fairness towards the continued support of the United States for *apartheid*. If people want to be fair to that, that would be unfair. From our point of view, the issue is still *apartheid*, and I think the General Assembly is the master of its own rules. Therefore we ask—I request—the Assembly to decide whether *apartheid* is an important issue or not.

150. The PRESIDENT: Does any other representative wish to speak for or against the motion as proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran? There appears to be none. I shall therefore ask the Assembly to take a decision. I shall put to the vote the motion as proposed by the representative of Iran that *apartheid* is an important question.

151. I call on the representative of the United States to speak on a point of order.

152. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): We have asked that a recorded vote be taken on this motion.

153. The PRESIDENT: Indeed, a recorded vote was requested.

154. I call on the representative of Ireland on a point of order.

155. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I would welcome some clarification of the matter that we are being asked to vote upon. Are we being asked to vote that *apartheid* is an important question, or are we being asked to vote that resolutions or amendments on *apartheid* should be decided by a two-thirds majority?

156. The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to clarify the matter.

157. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to reiterate the exact wording of the motion. It is as follows: Is *apartheid* an important issue or not?

158. We believe *apartheid* is an important issue; we believe *apartheid* has already been recognized as a crime against humanity. We hope that the General Assembly will agree with us that *apartheid* is an important issue. I hope it is understood.

159. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States of America to speak on a point of order.

160. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): If I may address the issue that has been raised by our colleague from Ireland, we believe that it is obvious that in the history of our treatment of the *apartheid* question it has never before been considered an important question requiring a two-thirds majority, within the meaning of the rules on that issue. It is clear that in this instance what motivates the suggestion is not a question of whether *apartheid* is important or whether the General Assembly's deliberations on that question are important. That is obviously the case. What motivates this move at this time is clearly a political desire to deprive the United States of a fair decision on the amendments which we have placed before the Assembly. We believe that it is crucial that the members of the Assembly should not be confused about this issue. The issue is not the issue of the importance of *apartheid*, for clearly

throughout the history of our treatment of this question we have understood *apartheid* to be an important issue to which we all devote a great deal of our time, attention and effort, both in this hall and elsewhere. The question is a basic issue of fairness and whether we consider the affirmation of those important questions and principles of fairness to be a necessary and absolutely indispensable part of our work here.

161. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Democratic Yemen to speak on a point of order.

162. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): If the delegation of the United States thinks that *apartheid* is an important question, then I do not think that we have a problem. All resolutions regarding *apartheid* will have to be voted on the basis of Article 18 of the Charter, by a two-thirds majority. I have asked to speak in order to explain my understanding of the Iranian motion. I believe that we are on the verge of a very important decision of the General Assembly, one which is similar to the very important decision taken in 1954 regarding Namibia [*resolution 844 (IX)*]. I therefore believe that the wording of the motion is exactly in consonance with special rule F of annex III regarding Namibia of the General Assembly rules of procedure, but in this case it has to do with *apartheid*. Therefore our understanding of the motion is as follows: decisions of the General Assembly on questions relating to reports and petitions concerning *apartheid* shall be regarded as important questions within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations.

163. I have found it necessary to explain this point so that there should be no confusion after the intervention of the representative of Ireland.

164. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

165. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): I think it is clear to all the extent to which some will go in order to attempt to distort the procedures, positions, principles and traditions of this General Assembly in order to achieve their own narrow and vindictive ends.

166. I believe that the issue before us is quite clear. It is not an issue that can be decided by attempting to apply one rule to a situation in which that rule is not applicable, violating therefore the very fundamental principle that we should not change the rules in the middle of the game. I believe that it is important to keep in mind this very fundamental principle of fairness, since what is at stake in an issue of this sort is not simply a substantive question with regard to our deliberations here today. At stake in an issue of this sort are the very foundations for the possibility of what we do here, whether we can come together and, despite our differences, discuss, disagree, but always know that there will be a basic civility and an acknowledgement of the fundamental rules of justice. If that is not to be the case today, if that is not to be the case in the General Assembly, my delegation believes that this point of order raises very serious questions and casts a very serious shadow over the future of the Organization as an open forum for open discussion and exchange and for true and fair consideration of the issues brought before us.

167. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

168. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): Since a number of different points of view have been expressed on this proposal already in this impromptu debate, I think that it would be helpful to the Assembly if you, Mr. President, could give us a ruling on the procedural implications of the decision we are being invited to take, both for the present issue, the motion which we are being asked to vote on later this morning, and for other future questions concerning *apartheid*.

169. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

170. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Although the pros and cons on the issue have been given, and although several delegations have spoken on this matter, the views have not been very different: there are only two views. Although they worded it differently, some representatives want to indicate that *apartheid* is not an important matter. My delegation believes that *apartheid* is a very important matter in exactly the same sense as that mentioned by the representative of Yemen. As is obvious to all, the peace and security of Africa have been and will remain threatened simply because of the policies of *apartheid*.

171. I therefore propose that the debate on this matter be adjourned and that my motion be put to a vote.

172. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the General Assembly is being called upon to determine that the question of *apartheid* and all resolutions and amendments relating thereto are to be decided by a two-thirds majority of representatives present and voting under rule 85 of the rules of procedure. That is my understanding with regard to this motion that the Assembly is being called upon to determine. I hope I have answered the representative of the United Kingdom.

173. I call on the representative of the Congo on a point of order.

174. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): I do not know whether your ruling, Mr. President, has put an end to the debate, but my delegation would like to stress its view that this is more than a procedural matter. If we were to decide in this hall whether *apartheid* is an important question or not, my response would be a positive one, because it is an African—indeed, a universal—position.

175. The Assembly has declared *apartheid* a crime against humanity; that is the least than can be said. To take a principled stand today on whether or not *apartheid* should be considered an important question is to commit ourselves totally. Rather, we should limit ourselves to declaring that *apartheid* is a very important issue, regardless of the procedural aspects that may be invoked in this hall.

176. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to the vote on the motion by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Let me repeat my understanding of the motion: The General Assembly is being called upon to determine that the question of *apartheid* and all resolutions and amendments relating thereto are to be decided by a two-thirds majority of representatives present and voting under rule 85. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominica, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belize, Burma, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Jamaica, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela.

The motion was adopted by 81 votes to 33, with 18 abstentions.[3]

177. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

178. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to point out to the Assembly that for my delegation, *apartheid* is of course an important issue. What in the view of our delegation is not important is the submission of amendments, that those amendments should be adopted by a two-thirds vote, for if someone decides that a sentence in a draft resolution should be submitted to amendment, it means that that could be deleted if a two-thirds vote were required.

179. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has no doubt that *apartheid* is an extremely important question. That is why we supported the adoption in the Security Council of urgent, binding, wide-ranging sanctions against South Africa. None the less, on this occasion my delegation cannot fail to note the relation between the fact that the Assembly is asked to recognize *apartheid* as an important issue for the purposes of a two-thirds vote and the fact that approval of the motion means that a Member State is being deprived of the right to have its amendments put to a vote in the Assembly.

180. For this reason, because we cannot fail to ignore the fact that this is a completely politicized vote, my delegation abstained.

181. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I shall begin my very brief point of order again with the name of God. I prayed to God that my motion would win the support of the General Assembly. I congratulate you, Sir, on this victory that was won under your presidency. I should like to request only that you reiterate your understanding, because some of the explanations of vote are creating ambiguity even for me.

182. So we decided that it is not an important issue psychologically; it is an important issue in the sense that *apartheid* and all resolutions and amendments related to it require a two-thirds majority. My motion does not prevent anybody from presenting any amendment or motion. Indeed, all amendments, motions and draft resolutions can be presented. The only issue that has been decided upon is that they will be decided by a two-thirds majority. That is all. There is no deprivation for anybody.

183. The PRESIDENT: I shall read out my understanding on which the General Assembly has voted. I said, a moment ago: "It is my understanding that the General Assembly is being called upon to determine that the question of *apartheid* and all resolutions and amendments relating thereto are to be decided by a two-thirds majority of representatives present and voting under rule 85." That was my understanding before I put the motion to the vote, and the General Assembly has now taken a decision. I shall continue calling on those who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the motion.

184. Mr. ALBÁN-HOLGUÍN (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): There can be no doubt that my delegation has always considered *apartheid* to be a question of the highest importance. We have always supported peoples in their struggle against *apartheid*. On the question of Namibia, we have always supported and encouraged actions aimed at the attainment of independence for that country.

185. As you explained, Sir, this is an issue related to a vote, not to the substance of the issue of *apartheid*, but voting procedure, and that is how my delegation understood it. For that reason, our vote should be understood exclusively as a reference to the system that will be used for voting on draft resolutions and amendments related to *apartheid*.

186. It seemed to me inappropriate that issues related to *apartheid* should be taken out of the general norms applying to United Nations resolutions, because that can turn against those of us who are waging the struggle against *apartheid*. There will be new obstructions in the way of draft resolutions that attempt to eliminate that crime. I believe that today in the Assembly we have made a mistake in approving this motion for a two-thirds vote.

187. The PRESIDENT: I see by the clock that it is past the hour. I have a long list of speakers before me on the motion just adopted by the General Assembly. It appears as I look at the list of speakers before the vote on the draft resolutions just introduced this morning that what is being said may be repeated when representatives are called upon to explain their vote before the vote on the draft resolutions. For our deliberations to run smoothly, I appeal to the Assembly that perhaps we could defer our explanations of vote on the decision that has just been taken on the motion by Iran until such time as we come to explain the votes either before or after the vote. That is the appeal I am making to the General Assembly. The Assembly may reject my appeal, since it is master of its own decisions. It is past the hour, and I thought members might wish to go for lunch and then explain in stronger terms their positions with regard to the item under discussion.

188. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): My delegation does not propose to take a position on the

appeal you have just made. However, we do think that it would be important as members think about that appeal to consider the fact that the decision we have just taken, procedural although it may have seemed, was a decision that touched upon the most fundamental principles of our relationships with one another here and of the possible further usefulness of this body as a forum for fair and just discussion.

189. It does seem to us that an issue of this kind is perhaps somewhat more important than our lunches. Perhaps not, since perhaps the attitude expressed in the vote today is one towards the character of the Organization that might suggest that lunch might be of higher priority to many. We do not necessarily subscribe to that view, and that is why we fought against this motion and in favour of certain fundamental principles of fairness.

190. We believe that it is important, given the fact that we had decided such an important issue, for Member States to go on record with their understanding of why they chose to violate those procedures, why they chose to violate those principles or, on the contrary, why they had the courage to stand up for them.

191. However, as you have suggested and as has been demonstrated today, this General Assembly is indeed the master of its own fate. It will also determine what the character of that fate will be, and I believe that it has taken a step in the wrong direction in that regard today.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] The delegation of Colombia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[2] The delegation of Colombia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolutions.

[3] The delegations of Egypt and Yemen subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the motion and the delegation of Malaysia, that it had intended not to participate in the vote.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

99th PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 13 December 1984,
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 31

Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid;*

(*b*) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

(*c*) Report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that when this morning's plenary meeting was adjourned, we had heard several explanations of vote on the motion presented by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The following speakers remain to be heard on that subject: Ecuador, Chile, Saint Lucia, Uruguay, Yemen, France, Bolivia, Ivory Coast and Ireland. I should like to request that other representatives wishing to speak this afternoon in explanation of their vote on that motion should kindly advise the Secretariat as soon as possible so that the General Assembly may proceed with its work in an orderly manner.

2. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This morning, according to your ruling, Mr. President, we were asked to vote on whether we should consider *apartheid* as an important question and whether all the draft resolutions or amendments on that question should be subject to the provisions of rule 85 of the General Assembly rules of procedure which require a two-thirds majority for adoption; that is, there have been votes on two different matters.

3. The delegation of Ecuador voted in favour of the motion because obviously *apartheid* is an important question, and, as everybody knows, it has been declared a crime against humanity. But it was not our intention in voting this way to agree that any Member State be deprived of the right to have its proposals accepted by a simple majority. An exclusion of this kind might have serious implications for the democratic stability of the world Organization and for the principle of free debate, which all of us should defend, support and strengthen.

4. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Chile has always felt that respect for human beings without any discrimination as to race is an essential principle of life among men and a *sine qua non* for the establishment of justice and equality. For this reason, in our constitutional and legal texts we give maximum importance to rejection of racial discrimination and, consequently, of *apartheid*. My country is absolutely convinced that the struggle against racial discrimination is the most important issue in which the United Nations is involved.

5. My delegation believes that in the vote which took place this morning the issue was not whether the rejection of *apartheid* was of major or minor importance, for if that were so, there is no question but that we would have voted against the universal scourge of racial discrimination. Our understanding was that this morning the Assembly was consulted on a procedural matter, and our vote was cast in accordance with that understanding. We regret that at the beginning of the vote, without prior notice, a matter was raised which lent itself to a dual interpretation, and it was a matter of major importance in respect of which Chile, as already stated, has a position which does not lend itself to doubt. Furthermore, my delegation fears that the procedure established, rather than assisting the struggle against *apartheid* in the future, might be harmful to it.

6. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia): It will take increased and sustained world-wide pressure finally to eliminate the scourge of *apartheid* from our midst.

7. While the General Assembly remains perpetually seized of the question of *apartheid*, domestic anti-*apartheid* movements in various countries have historically been subject to cyclical, indeed even episodic, patterns. Today at a time when once again there is a rising crescendo of anger against *apartheid*, the General Assembly, by the callous and politically inspired motion adopted earlier today, can only alienate many of the ardent supporters of the anti-*apartheid* movement and therefore hasten the deflation of that now ballooning movement, which is finally beginning to show signs of some permanency. That the motion was politically motivated and without serious concern for the people of South Africa, who continue to labour under the crushing boot of *apartheid*, is evidenced by the fact that resolutions on *apartheid* have traditionally been adopted by the Assembly with more than a two-thirds majority. Hence there was no need to adopt such an immutable rule.

8. The motion has created a *de jure* condition of literary intransigence *vis-à-vis apartheid* resolutions and in essence has given the final word on anti-*apartheidism* to a small and select few whose own actions often belie their words.

9. Further, in these times of mounting foreign policy pragmatism, my delegation fears that the motion adopted will force some States which heretofore eagerly supported anti-*apartheid* resolutions to

reassess their position. For those reasons, my delegation did not support the motion.

10. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation's vote on the second procedural debate with regard to the requirement of a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly on the policy of *apartheid* should be interpreted strictly within the context of the proposal, meaning that it was a procedural motion proposed in very special circumstances. On the substance of the subject, my delegation has already stated and states again today, clearly, that it categorically rejects the policies of *apartheid* and opposes any form of discrimination; within the international community there is no doubt that there is a consensus on rejection of such policies.

11. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation is well aware of the importance of the question of *apartheid*. Indeed, on many occasions we have condemned the policies of *apartheid* in all its aspects; but my delegation could not agree to the procedure followed a short time ago.

12. Article 18 of the Charter of the United Nations gives the list of important questions justifying a two-thirds majority. In our view, it is clear that the question put to the Assembly relating to the amendment presented by the United States was not part of this list.

13. Coming directly after the failure of the motion to prevent the Assembly from dealing with those amendments, the Iranian motion was obviously aimed at obstructing the adoption of the American amendments.

14. We regret that the Assembly deemed it appropriate to accept that diversion of its proper procedure.

15. Mrs. CARRASCO MONJE (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of *apartheid* has always received much attention from the Republic of Bolivia. For this reason, we have supported all resolutions condemning this horrible crime against humanity. Consequently, in the voting this morning, my delegation cast an affirmative vote on the understanding that we were reiterating the basic substance of our condemnation of *apartheid*.

16. If the vote had been as indicated on the voting paper, my delegation would have abstained. But, because it is difficult to draw a qualitative distinction between substance and procedure in the question of *apartheid*, as the President of the Assembly said, my delegation voted in keeping with the traditional position of Bolivia, which is to reject all forms of racial discrimination, in particular *apartheid*.

17. My delegation would also like to make it clear that we respect and support the right of any delegation to introduce amendments to draft resolutions being considered by the General Assembly.

18. Mr. ESSY (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): Is *apartheid* an important question or is it not? Can such a question even be put to an African State? I do not think so, for the reply is obvious.

19. The Ivory Coast voted against the Iranian motion because this was merely a procedural ploy to bind the hands of certain States, with obvious political aims.

20. The Ivory Coast is an African country, and as blacks we have suffered more than any other continent from the humiliating effects of *apartheid*. In this complex, serious problem, where entire populations are daily suffering physically, we are not trying here to adopt resolutions just to ease our conscience. We are trying to produce solutions, and for this reason we are prepared to examine any possibility of moving closer as soon as possible to the common goal, which is the complete elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa.

21. In reality, the draft amendments which gave rise to this *ad hoc* procedure do not in most cases basically change the substance of the problems dealt with in the draft resolutions on *apartheid*. In the resolutions adopted by the Assembly, the demand for the withdrawal of foreign troops, instead of including the name of the great Power, which everyone knows, changes absolutely nothing as regards substance.

22. That is why my delegation will consider all amendments before the Assembly in the light of the substantive issue involved.

23. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): My delegation abstained in the vote on the motion before us this morning relating to the adoption of draft resolutions and decisions on *apartheid* by a two-thirds majority.

24. We felt that we could not vote for a motion in terms related to rule 85 of the rules of procedure, the obvious effect of which would be to introduce a voting criterion clearly directed towards particular draft amendments.

25. Yet we did not feel we could vote against the motion, since it was so clearly indicated in the Assembly that it was being related to the issue of whether *apartheid* was an important question, as it undoubtedly is. In the circumstances, we abstained. We felt that we simply could not indicate our positions on two separate issues by one positive or one negative vote.

26. Mr. BANGO BANGO (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): Zaire has no doubt that *apartheid* is an important question because *apartheid*—that policy condemned by all countries, that policy which the General Assembly has called a crime against humanity, that policy which debases the black man and reduces him to the level of an animal—has frequently been condemned by the Assembly, and South Africa, the promoter of these policies, has been expelled from the Assembly.

27. Obviously then, Zaire could only vote in favour of the question whether *apartheid* is or is not an important question. But Zaire is also of the opinion that certain passages in the various draft resolutions before the Assembly are inappropriate and unfair to certain States Members.

28. The condemnation found therein tends to be selective. Zaire believes that certain countries should not be favoured over others in the General Assembly. It is not a question of the degree of estimation of the gravity of co-operation with the heinous *apartheid* régime.

29. In the resolutions we have adopted on this subject, it is nowhere suggested that it is appropriate to assess the degree of co-operation of a country with South Africa. For this reason, Zaire, although it voted in favour of the motion, wishes to say that the amendments submitted were not irrelevant and it was unfair to the country that submitted them not to consider them. Selective condemnation hardly contributes to the common struggle against *apartheid*.

30. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): The views of my Government on the policy

of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa were set forth in detail in the statement we made on 20 November in the General Assembly [*68th meeting*].

31. On that occasion, we reaffirmed our commitment to efforts being made to eliminate that policy. That is why my delegation voted this morning in favour of the motion determining the political importance of that problem.

32. However, my delegation would have preferred this decision not to have been taken in connection with certain amendments, all of which deserved consideration and a vote in the Assembly. It would have been more fair, and certainly more democratic, not to use procedural techniques which have somewhat distorted the outcome of a debate that began on 20 November last [*ibid.*], well before this morning's motion.

33. Mr. KNIPPING-VICTORIA (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am grateful for this opportunity to explain my vote on the motion adopted by the Assembly this morning.

34. First of all, I should like solemnly to reiterate the constant and unswerving position of the Dominican Republic in condemning and rejecting the policies of *apartheid*, which we consider an affront to the conscience of mankind and a crime against humanity.

35. For the Government of the Dominican Republic, *apartheid* is a very important question; there can be no doubt about that in this hall. We would also state that this unequivocal position of principle is the very essence of our sense of nationhood. Our country, after all, is made up of a mixture of different races, and we are very proud of that.

36. The Dominican Republic abstained in the voting in the belief that the issue of whether *apartheid* was an important question and needed a two-thirds majority was procedural and emotions were running high. We felt it inappropriate that opinions here should be divided on a subject that deserved resolute unanimity on the part of the international community and to reflect clearly the universal sentiment that this most important subject deserves.

37. Mr. SUYOI (Brunei Darussalam): My delegation had not intended to speak in explanation of vote, but in view of what happened this morning we feel compelled to explain our position. My delegation decided not to participate in the voting on the motion of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. However, this should not be interpreted as meaning that my delegation does not consider the *apartheid* issue important. It is important, and my delegation will always support efforts to end *apartheid* in South Africa. But the introduction of procedural motions in the Assembly as to whether *apartheid* is an important issue or not leads my delegation to ask if the *apartheid* policy of the Government of South Africa has ever been treated as a less than important issue. My delegation would like to believe that it has not. My delegation believes that the Assembly has consistently considered the eradication of the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa to be very important, and we are here to consider measures to end those policies of *apartheid*.

38. My Government has intended to vote for all of the draft resolutions now before the Assembly, and it will do so whether they are amended or not, as we feel that grave injustices have been done the black people of South Africa and that until the *apartheid* and racist policies of the Government of South Africa have been eliminated, none of us here should consider our work completed. It is no doubt a sad fact that not all delegations could agree to the formulations of the draft resolutions, but this should not prevent us from continuing our work to eradicate *apartheid* and racism in South Africa and wherever they may exist.

39. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This morning, in connection with the sovereign right to present amendments to draft resolutions, it being understood that all States Members of the Organization have an equal right to present such amendments, especially when the general intention is to avoid ambiguity, a procedural question was raised as to whether it was appropriate to adopt certain amendments by a two-thirds majority or a simple majority. This ambiguity led to politicization of the vote and disrupted the unity we have enjoyed in face of the opprobrious policy of *apartheid*. Because of its very nature, *apartheid* has always been considered an important question, and there has never been any need to raise procedural questions which, at bottom, because of the intention behind them, reduce the importance of the expected vote on this item.

40. We abstained in the voting because, although we were well aware that the motivations behind the proposals were counter-productive, we did not want to leave any trace of doubt about Honduras' firm rejection of any form of racial discrimination. Our abstention implies complete rejection of such procedural quibbles, which are at variance with the principle of mutual respect that should prevail in the Assembly.

41. Given this explanation, it must be understood that our abstention in the vote implies a complete rejection of this sort of procedural sophistry, which is harmful to the harmony and mutual respect that should be maintained in the Assembly and to a serious approach to the items on our agenda.

42. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Mr. President, I am conscious of your appeal that delegations speak in explanation of vote only once, but we regard this issue as so important that I regret I feel obliged to intervene on this specific question. I should like to explain the Australian delegation's vote on the Iranian amendment, the adoption of which I believe was a serious mistake that will have wide-ranging ramifications for this body. That amendment was based on Article 18 of the Charter. Let me reiterate briefly the questions enumerated under that Article which require a two-thirds majority: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council, the election of the members of the Economic and Social Council, the election of members of the Trusteeship Council, the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members, questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship system and budgetary questions. The Iranian proposal fell under none of these items, and my delegation voted against it.

43. *Apartheid* is obviously a very important issue among the issues before the Assembly. The overwhelming majority of this body regards *apartheid*

with repugnance, and that has been made plain on many occasions. That is incontestible; but what we were being asked to decide was whether it was an important item in terms of Article 18 of the Charter and rule 85 of the rules of procedure. My delegation's view was that it was not. If *apartheid* was not treated procedurally as an important question in 1981, 1982, 1983 and before that, why suddenly should it be so treated? The answer is obvious. The Assembly's decision this morning is regrettable. It was an attempt to circumscribe debate and stifle criticism.

44. In rejecting the amendment of the representative of Nigeria, the Assembly indicated its willingness to address the amendments before us. The Iranian motion was a substantial and political motion in the guise of a procedural measure, and in the terms in which it was moved, it commanded the support of the majority in this hall. We believe that decision was short-sighted and may have far-reaching effects for the future conduct of the Assembly's proceedings. Resolutions on *apartheid* have regularly been carried by a two-thirds majority or more. This morning's decision was therefore unnecessary, as well as being ill-advised. It was politically motivated to stifle the free flow of debate and was therefore objectionable to my delegation.

45. Today the General Assembly decided that *apartheid* was an important issue, basically with the purpose of avoiding consideration of amendments. What decision shall we take tomorrow, and what issues shall we make important in the future, and what will the effects of this be on the workings of the Assembly? I would just like to pose those questions in explaining why my delegation voted against the Iranian proposal.

46. Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): In order that our non-participation in the voting on the motion relating to the question whether *apartheid* matters require a two-thirds majority not be misconstrued or misinterpreted, I would like to reaffirm in explicit terms the firm and unequivocal opposition of my Government to the policy of *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination. The policy of *apartheid* is one that really deserves international condemnation and as such is a matter of great importance, being a subject that has time and again been placed not only before the Assembly but also before various international forums.

47. Having said this, we also believe that proposals and amendments that are placed before the Assembly should be given the possibility of being considered and debated purely on their merits, so that any outstanding problems can be resolved in order to reach a consensus on the texts placed before the Assembly.

48. Mr. MOSELEY (Barbados): My delegation is second to none in its resolve that the heinous crime of *apartheid* shall sooner rather than later perish from this earth. However, my delegation considers that there is a real danger that from motives born of conflicting political ideologies or nationalistic instincts the real issue, namely, the destruction of *apartheid*, may become clouded and watered down. In my delegation's view, there should be no cloud on the right of every Member State to make an input towards a solution of the real problem. Procedural motions based on motives open to question in our view do nothing but weaken the main thrust, namely, the eradication of *apartheid*, and for that reason we refused to participate in the vote.

49. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): It was quite clear from the manoeuvres that were employed this morning that the amendments put forward by the United States had the support of the majority of this body, and that explains why it was necessary to resort to procedural manoeuvres in order to avoid having a decision taken by that majority.

50. However, in the light of the events that took place this morning we believe that these amendments at this time could not be fairly considered, and we therefore withdraw our amendments contained in documents A/39/L.43 and L.44. I repeat, we withdraw these amendments.

51. In addition, the United States requests that separate votes be taken on four paragraphs in draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and L.30. I will specify these paragraphs. We ask that in draft resolution A/39/L.28 separate votes be taken on the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 15 and 18. And we ask that in draft resolution A/39/L.30 a separate vote be taken on the fifth preambular paragraph.

52. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any or all of the seven draft resolutions. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes have been taken.

53. I should like to remind the Assembly that under rule 88 of the rules of procedure: "The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment."

54. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I wish to make a statement on the draft resolutions on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

55. The Ten, in their common statement in the course of the debate on agenda item 31, unreservedly condemned the practice of *apartheid* and reiterated their conviction that it must be eradicated and must give way to a society based on genuine representative democracy. The Ten continue to urge the Government of South Africa to respond to the wishes of the majority of its citizens and of the international community as a whole by introducing rapid and fundamental changes in South Africa to end *apartheid* before the opportunities for peaceful change have passed. They believe that the United Nations has a role of primary importance to play in the efforts exerted to eliminate *apartheid*.

56. *Apartheid* is an evil system which violates the fundamental rights of the majority of the citizens of South Africa. The general debate on the item has demonstrated the unanimous opposition of the Assembly to *apartheid*. It is regrettable therefore that, as last year, objectionable elements have been maintained in some of the draft resolutions.

57. The Ten wish to reaffirm their commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. The specialized agencies should also retain their universal character and their statutes should be taken properly into account.

58. The Ten maintain that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the division of competences between the General Assembly and the Security Council must be respected.

59. The Ten do not consider the situation in South Africa to be a problem of decolonization. Their opposition to the practice of *apartheid* in South Africa is aimed at the establishment there of a society based on freedom, equality and social justice for all South Africans, irrespective of race or colour.

60. The Ten have condemned the use of violence from any quarter to solve the problems of southern Africa, including the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States neighbouring South Africa. The Ten are deeply concerned about the plight of refugees from South Africa.

61. The attitude of the member States of the European Community towards endorsement of armed struggle in resolutions of the General Assembly is well known. They are conscious that the continued existence of *apartheid* policies in South Africa suggests to many that these policies will be ended only through armed struggle. They believe, however, that the United Nations has above all the obligation to encourage peaceful solutions.

62. The Ten consider that demands to cut off all relations with South Africa are counterproductive to our common objective in this Assembly, which is the total eradication of *apartheid*. In the view of the Ten, channels of communication with South Africa should remain open in order to permit the outside world to continue to impress on South Africa its unequivocal rejection of the abhorrent and morally unacceptable system of *apartheid* and that there is an urgent need for the introduction of rapid and fundamental change.

63. The Ten remain dedicated to the Olympic ideal of non-discrimination and reject any form of *apartheid* in sports. They must point out, however, that sport is organized on a private basis in their countries. Their sporting organizations are aware of their Governments' opposition to sporting contacts in violation of the Olympic ideal. The Governments of the Ten will continue firmly to discourage sporting contacts involving racial discrimination.

64. The Ten reject all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on Member States or groups of countries.

65. The 10 member States of the Community regret that, for the reasons which I have pointed out, they will not be able to support all of the draft resolutions on this item before the Assembly. They reaffirm that they will continue to use their collective weight to influence the Government of South Africa to put an end to the abhorrent system of *apartheid* and to establish a society in which everybody, without exception, will enjoy equality, freedom and justice.

66. Mr. BARBOSA de MEDINA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): First, I should like to refer to the vote taken this morning on the procedural motion put forward by the Iranian delegation. I should like to emphasize that my delegation pronounced itself at that time on a very precise procedural motion dealing with specific amendments in the context of specific draft resolutions.

67. My delegation obviously considers the question of *apartheid* as an important one in the sense of Article 18 of the Charter of the United Nations, like many other delegations which have also explained their vote before me. I should therefore like to emphasize that nothing in our vote should in any way be construed as contradicting that understanding.

68. In the course of this debate, my delegation has frequently expressed Portugal's opposition to all forms of racism and to the principles inherent in any society which is based on racial exclusivity or superiority. We have also reiterated on a number of occasions our support for any initiative whose purpose is to promote the necessary structural changes for the creation of a social system that might eliminate the tensions created by a régime based on the systematic and institutionalized practice of discrimination.

69. That opposition and support are the very basis of the position taken on *apartheid* by Portugal, which was the precursor of an age-old rejection of racism as a violation of a fundamental principle of law, universally recognized and enshrined in our Constitution. Portugal's vote in favour of resolution 39/2—which was adopted earlier at this session [*13th meeting*]—is a reflection of that profound conviction of the need to abolish the policies of *apartheid* and bantustanization, with all the risks of violence and conflict that they entail.

70. In this matter, where it is not simply a question of securing a modification of the prevailing system in South Africa but of undertaking fundamental changes, my Government has always worked to obtain that end by peaceful means. Portugal also believes it essential that all armed conflict and any kind of destructive violence be ruled out because we fear the disastrous consequences that would be visited upon the South African people and the dramatic effects they would have on neighbouring independent States.

71. Portugal could not support so-called piecemeal solutions that would be vain attempts to deal with a global issue. Nor, on the other hand, could we agree that resort to indiscriminate violence is a valid way of turning South Africa into a free, democratic and multiracial society and at the same time bringing peace and prosperity to southern Africa.

72. Likewise, my Government does not believe that the total isolation of South Africa can serve our essential purpose of bringing about the fundamental changes that we have called on that country to make. Indeed, Portugal is profoundly convinced that there is need to keep the international community in a state of mobilization in its efforts against racism, and we are also aware of the fact that the effective eradication of that phenomenon will hinge on a change in mental attitude capable of promoting a feeling of community and equality among the various ethnic elements. It is a fact of history that lack of movement, rather than evolution, is what keeps a country outside the community of nations.

73. The regional arrangements that have taken place might help, in certain circumstances, to demonstrate the value of a policy of keeping in contact—one which Portugal pursues. Keeping in contact should not be confused with acts of assistance or solidarity with the *apartheid* régime, because they permit acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring States in flagrant violation of international law. Owing to historical and cultural links, my delegation would like here to confirm its solidarity with those States, and particularly with the peoples of Angola and Mozambique, which are victims of the present unstable situation prevailing in southern Africa.

74. In this context, my delegation will not substantially change the vote it has so often cast in the General Assembly. While we have reservations about

certain aspects of these draft resolutions which encourage violence and contain discriminatory references or certain imprecise language—in particular, paragraphs 5, 7 and 9 of draft resolution A/39/L.36—we will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.29 and L.31 to L.33. My delegation hopes that it can thus make a realistic contribution to the efforts to find a lasting, just and peaceful solution to the problems which beset southern Africa.

75. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland.

76. The Nordic countries' condemnation of *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination has been voiced in the Assembly on many occasions. The entire system of *apartheid* must be eliminated and give way to a system based on genuine representative democracy. This rejection is based on the Nordic concepts of justice, freedom and democracy and on our belief in the equality and dignity of every human being.

77. Our commitment to these goals is demonstrated by the measures taken by the Nordic countries in accordance with the Joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa. The Nordic countries have consulted with relevant parties, especially the front-line States, on how to co-ordinate our efforts in the fight against *apartheid*. It is against that background that we joined in sponsoring a new draft resolution concerning concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid*. We will again support most of the resolutions concerning the *apartheid* policy of the South African Government.

78. In view of the attitude of our countries towards the *apartheid* system, we regret that we are not able to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions. Some of them again cause us substantial difficulties. These difficulties concern questions of principle, some of them encountered in more than one draft resolution. I shall briefly describe them.

79. First, the Nordic countries consider universality one of the basic principles of international organizations. We cannot therefore accept any formulation that in one way or another seems to put that principle in doubt.

80. Secondly, the United Nations has above all the obligation to encourage peaceful solutions to international problems. Therefore, we cannot accept endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle.

81. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. This procedure makes it all the more difficult to maintain the international consensus in the struggle against *apartheid*.

82. Fourthly, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States.

83. Fifthly, the implementation of some of the resolutions would encroach upon the constitutional freedoms and rights of Nordic citizens and private organizations.

84. Sixthly, the Nordic countries consider that only a free democratic process based on universal suffrage can determine who can represent the South African people.

85. These are the considerations on which most of our reservations are based. In particular, they apply to draft resolution L.28 concerning sanctions against South Africa, and draft resolution A/39/L.30 concerning relations between Israel and South Africa.

86. Humanitarian assistance to the refugees and the victims of *apartheid* also forms an important part of the measures taken by the Nordic Governments in accordance with the Joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa. We have again this year introduced resolutions reflecting those policies. In so doing, we demonstrate that our commitment actively to combat the evil of *apartheid* remains firm.

87. The Nordic countries voted against the motion to require a two-thirds majority on the *apartheid* resolutions and amendments before us, for one reason: because the purpose was to deprive the Members of the General Assembly of their legitimate rights to express their detailed reasons and to properly influence the decisions of the General Assembly. The negative vote of the Nordic countries does not, of course, relate to the well-known Nordic position *vis-a-vis apartheid*.

88. Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. President, you have appealed to us to explain our vote on the motion to require a two-thirds majority on all decisions on *apartheid* in connection with the explanations on the pertinent resolutions themselves.

89. My delegation believes, as indeed do all delegations, that *apartheid* is an important issue. We have nevertheless voted against the motion presented by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran because it was not clear to us what the objective of that motion really was. Was it to give to our common condemnation of *apartheid* a stronger expression? Or was its purpose in reality directed against a particular proposal put forward by the United States? We deeply deplore the fact that the latter seems to be true. We strongly oppose any action that would make the important question of *apartheid* an instrument to prejudice the position of another member State in the Assembly, and this in a manner which was clearly unfair.

90. I would now like to explain our vote on the draft resolutions that are before the Assembly. The representative of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, has already commented on the draft resolutions we are about to vote on, recalling essential political principles shared by those countries, including my own.

91. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, as is well known, rejects strongly the *apartheid* policy of South Africa as an institutionalized system of racial discrimination. We condemn and repudiate the *apartheid* system because this system violates human rights and disregards human dignity. The results of the latest parliamentary-chamber election and the continued violence in South Africa reinforce the concern felt by my Government that the majority of those affected fail to see the new South African constitution either as a constructive step forward or as a sufficiently large political concession. Furthermore, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has been greatly concerned that the constitutional reform contains no

measures aimed at granting political rights to the black majority.

92. Peaceful changes in favour of the oppressed majority of South Africa are urgent and necessary for the benefit of all parts of the population of that country. In a dialogue with all relevant forces, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany endeavours to defuse by its peace policy the tense situation in South Africa and to contribute towards the establishment of an equitable and lasting order. In so doing, the Federal Government strictly adheres to the arms embargo imposed on South Africa by the Security Council. Anyone claiming the contrary does so against his own better knowledge.

93. My Government agrees with the main thrust of the above-mentioned draft resolutions. It is therefore with much regret that, because of certain formulations in the draft resolutions, my Government is not in a position to support all of them. In particular, we strongly reject the unfounded criticism directed against the Western countries, suggesting that they are encouraging South Africa to escalate violence and oppression against the oppressed people in South Africa and to commit acts of aggression and destabilization against independent African States.

94. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.29, L.32 and L.33, in spite of certain objectionable formulations, specifically in A/39/L.29 and L.32. With regard to draft resolution A/39/L.29, my delegation has concerns about some recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22*] relating to its programme of work. If my delegation is voting for draft resolution A/39/L.29 contrary to the position it took last year, it does so because it believes in its main concern. Furthermore, my delegation hopes that the Special Committee against *Apartheid* will display a more equitable and balanced position towards the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western States in its publications. Also, my delegation would like to place on record its reservations as to the financial implications inherent in this draft resolution as well as in draft resolution A/39/L.32.

95. Moreover, my delegation would like to emphasize that we strongly object to the mentioning of any country by name in the text of the resolutions. That is why my delegation would have strongly supported all amendments aiming at deleting the names of countries in these texts.

96. Finally, let me express the firm hope of my delegation that the General Assembly will be able, at its fortieth session, to deal with resolutions which will eventually be supported by all members of this body.

97. Mr. STEFANINI (Italy): Let me first clarify our position on the motion presented by the Iranian delegation and voted on this morning.

98. Italy shares the concern expressed by many other delegations on this divisive vote which was forced on the Assembly by the Iranian motion. We believe that *apartheid* is indeed a question of primary importance. There can be little doubt about it in anybody's mind. In fact, it is given the highest priority, as it deserves, in the United Nations. We are convinced that it must continue to receive such priority.

99. We voted against the Iranian motion because the issue at stake was not the importance of *apartheid* but the importance of the respect for the rules of procedure of the Assembly—in other words, the very fairness of our decisions. What happened this morning was an unfortunate event which we may all regret in the future.

100. Let me now turn to the draft resolutions before us. In his earlier statement, the representative of Ireland expressed the views of the 10 member States of the European Community on those draft resolutions. Italy entirely supports his remarks.

101. My delegation wishes to specify further some points which are particularly significant to us. In our view, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* deserves respect and support for carrying out a demanding and essential task. Its role is extremely useful in order for us to achieve the goal we all share: the complete eradication of *apartheid*. To signify once again our support, we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.29 on the programme of work of the Special Committee, in spite of some reservations. Such reservations do not stem from the text before us but are related to the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22*]. In this connection, Italy wants to put on record that its vote in favour of the draft resolution does not imply acceptance or endorsement of all the conclusions and recommendations of the report. Indeed, my delegation views many of them with some concern.

102. Let me now turn to draft resolution A/39/L.36 concerning concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid*. We do share this goal; we believe in the need for the international community to maintain and increase its pressure on South Africa towards this end. Moreover, we welcome the initiative of the sponsors of this draft resolution—among which there are three member States of the European Community—in so far as they have avoided the inclusion of extraneous elements and presented us with the kind of clear-cut and straightforward text we would like to find in all resolutions. We fully support the call for political freedom and the abolition of the *apartheid* structures; we agree on many other provisions of the draft resolution. However, we have reservations on some formulations and, in particular, we cannot support paragraphs 5 and 9 and some of the elements in paragraph 7. Therefore, Italy will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.36.

103. Mr. WARD (New Zealand): New Zealand rejects South Africa's policy of *apartheid* in all its manifestations. As we said in our statement in the general debate on the item [*70th meeting*], the *apartheid* system is an offence against the dignity of mankind and a travesty of the principles underpinning the Organization. *Apartheid* is contrary to the New Zealand way of life and the values of the multiracial society we are building.

104. My delegation's votes on the draft resolutions before us will leave no one in any doubt about New Zealand's rejection of racism. My Government believes that the international community should consider applying a range of selective measures that would bring home to the South African Government the fact that their policies and practices have no place in today's world. For this reason we have co-sponsored the draft resolution A/39/L.36. For the same reason, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.28, even though we have reservations about some of its rhetoric and sweeping demands. My delegation cannot agree with the

endorsement of armed struggle by the General Assembly, nor with the selective criticisms that mar this text. New Zealand would have supported the amendments proposed in documents A/39/L.43 and L.44.

105. New Zealand will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.31 on *apartheid* in sports. My Government actively discourages New Zealand sports people from having contacts with South Africa until *apartheid* is abolished and South African teams are wholly representative. New Zealand's policy largely accords with the goals sought by the *Ad Hoc* Committee, though legal obstacles might preclude New Zealand's adherence to an international convention on the lines at present proposed.

106. We have reservations about some aspects of draft resolution A/39/L.29 on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, but to demonstrate our support for the objectives of the Special Committee's work, we will vote for that draft resolution. Our willingness to work with the international community in practical ways for the elimination of *apartheid* is also demonstrated by our support for draft resolutions A/39/L.32 and L.33.

107. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation would like to add to the statement made on behalf of the 10 European Community countries by the representative of Ireland, by way of making the following remarks.

108. France, as everyone knows, condemns outright the policy of *apartheid* of the South African Government. We have said this on a number of occasions quite clearly, and we have proved this by our deeds. This position of France was given solemn expression once again by Mr. Cheysson, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the meeting organized in his honour on 9 October this year by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

109. Recalling the historic role of France in the struggle against racism, Mr. Cheysson declared in the statement he made on that occasion:

> "Therefore, my country categorically, unreservedly and unambiguously denounces institutionalized racism and the practices which derive from it. As far as we know, the only form of legal racism still existing in the world is in South Africa, and it is the *apartheid* régime, which we condemn."

110. My country firmly supports all those who work to establish justice and to ensure that the dignity of one and all is recognized in South Africa. It fully supports the Special Committee in continuing its mission of providing information about and denouncing everything that affects the policy of *apartheid*, as indicated by the presence of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France at that exceptional meeting held on 9 October.

111. It is for that reason that the French delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.29, which endorses the programme of work of the Special Committee, although we do not approve of all the points contained in it.

112. Likewise, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.32, which encourages the United Nations to promote public information and public involvement in international action to eliminate *apartheid*. The French Government has proved its keenness on providing public information on *apartheid* matters. Through its Minister for Foreign Affairs, it sought recently to underline its commitment in this area by announcing a contribution, for the first time in 1985, to the United Nations Trust Fund for Publicity against *Apartheid*.

113. Furthermore, while reserving its position on the contents of any future draft convention, France intends to give its support to draft resolution A/39/L.31, in order to indicate its rejection of any discrimination in sports.

114. As the representative of Ireland did before me when he spoke on behalf of the 10 European Community countries, I should like to express my regret that France is unable to give its support to all the draft resolutions presented under this agenda item. The French delegation very strongly voices the hope that the sponsors of draft resolutions on *apartheid* will in future take account of the position of several delegations in connection with formulas which weaken the impact of certain draft resolutions and do not make it possible for them to be supported by all members of the Assembly.

115. *Apartheid* is unanimously condemned by the Assembly. Let us together try to find, wherever possible, formulations which make it possible for us to reflect this unanimity in our voting. My delegation is convinced that this goal can be reached without at the same time weakening the condemnation, thereby enhancing the impact of the resolutions, which is something we hope to see.

116. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Ecuador unswervingly rejects any form of racial discrimination, especially its most reprehensible form, *apartheid*, which is considered a crime against mankind. This position is not based on passing circumstances nor on national or international political pressure. It comes from Ecuador's convictions as a country with mixed ethnic origins, proud of its human resources, which grew from a crucible of many races who live together in equality, based on the principles of freedom and democracy.

117. The political Constitution of Ecuador, which arose from a popular referendum, states in Article 4: "The Ecuadoran State condemns all forms of colonialism, neocolonialism and racial discrimination or segregation. It recognizes the right of peoples to liberate themselves from these oppressive systems."

118. In Article 19, paragraph 4, the Constitution states: "All forms of discrimination for reasons of race, color, sex, language, religion, filiation, political or other opinions, social origin, economic position or birth are forbidden."

119. Ecuador for this reason is a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [*resolution 2106 A (XX), annex*]. We were the first State to accede to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [*resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex*].

120. For these reasons, my country, together with other Latin American States, for more than 20 years has always joined in the support for our brothers in Africa expressed in resolutions on the subject which reflect a painful tragedy for the people of South Africa and a universal concern to find solutions.

121. Ecuador does not agree with a selective approach to human rights, and we believe that all States disregarding United Nations resolutions should be condemned, be they great or small. For this reason, we will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on the subject of *apartheid* solely because of the anti-discriminatory principles mentioned, but we do not

agree that some countries should be singled out and not others in similar circumstances. We would have preferred that racism should be condemned, but in lofty language, without descending to formulas which are themselves discriminatory in nature.

122. In the case of draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and L.30, Ecuador supports any policy aimed at the elimination of racial discrimination, no matter where it may occur—that is, a universal condemnation—but we do not agree with certain selective paragraphs in the texts which are worded inappropriately and will not bring about a solution to the problem. Instead, an attempt should be made to bring about an understanding rather than heightening already existing tensions.

123. My delegation reiterates its support for the struggle of the African peoples against any situation of neo-colonialism or discrimination and in favour of democracy, human rights and justice throughout the world.

124. Mr. MEESMAN (Netherlands): In the debate on the question of *apartheid* [*69th meeting*], my delegation has already expressed the view that the abolition of this system of institutionalized racial segregation remains one of the most important tasks confronting the international community. The Netherlands Government has consistently condemned the racial policies practised by South Africa. The *apartheid* laws, each of which contradicts fundamental human rights, add up to a repressive system that deprives the majority of South Africa's people of a life in dignity and freedom. The recent wave of violence and oppression in South Africa has demonstrated once more the urgent need to replace *apartheid* by a truly democratic society in which all South Africans, irrespective of race, colour, sex or creed, enjoy equal political and economic rights.

125. In its efforts to contribute to the early elimination of *apartheid,* my Government continues to give priority to concerted international action within the framework of the United Nations. The debate on this question has shown that the Members of the Organization agree in their judgement that this should be our common goal and that collective action offers the best prospects for bringing to bear effective pressure on the Government of South Africa. One would have expected therefore that draft resolutions before the Assembly would have been drafted with a view to translating this broad consensus into a statement of principles and a programme of concrete action to which all Members of the United Nations could subscribe. We note with regret, however, that once again some of the draft resolutions before us contain elements which are more likely to stir up controversy and mutual recrimination than to contribute to our common cause.

126. In his statement on the resolutions on behalf of the Ten, which we fully endorse, the representative of Ireland has already set forth a number of principles commonly adhered to by the member States of the European Community. We firmly reject the practice of name-calling and arbitrary criticism against certain States or groups of countries. For that reason, and that reason only, my delegation intended to vote in favour of the amendments introduced by the United States. We deeply deplore the fact that these amendments were not put to the vote as a result of a procedural move, ostensibly on the question of *apartheid,* but which had no other objective than the retention of wording in the draft resolutions which was not only objectionable to the United States but, in the view of my delegation, not justified. My delegation therefore voted against the Iranian motion to apply to the question of *apartheid* the two-thirds majority rule. Furthermore, the Netherlands objects to the expressions of support for the concept of armed struggle, which is incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In our view, the situation in South Africa is not a colonial one. From this it follows that although the Netherlands supports the efforts of the African National Congress of South Africa [*ANC*] and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania [*PAC*] as anti-*apartheid* movements, we do not recognize them as liberation movements. Also we continue to have reservations about the applicability of the prisoner-of-war status under the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of 12 August 1949[1] and Additional Protocol I of 1977.[2]

127. All these considerations apply to the draft resolution on comprehensive sanctions. My delegation deeply deplores the truly alarming spirit of hostility to one particular group of States displayed in this text. Member States may differ in their choice of policies aimed at the elimination of *apartheid,* but to seize upon these differences to excoriate certain countries is a practice which strikes at the very roots of the Organization and must be repudiated. However, we also disagree with the general thrust of the draft resolution. We shall therefore vote against it. The Netherlands Government fears that the total isolation of South Africa and comprehensive sanctions against that country will gravely exacerbate existing tensions and will inflict intolerable suffering on the people of South Africa and neighbouring States. The Netherlands has therefore adopted a two-track policy, aimed at increasing the political and economic pressure on the South African Government while using existing channels of communication to encourage forces of peaceful change in South Africa's society. Apart from these reservations, however, it is our opinion that the selective, mandatory sanctions mentioned in paragraph 11 point the way to possible future collective action against the Government of South Africa.

128. This brings me to the draft resolution on concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid.* We greatly value this constructive attempt to present a broad platform for concrete common measures, and we will vote in favour of it. In previous years, my Government has already advocated or implemented many of the steps proposed in this draft resolution. For instance, the Netherlands has declared itself in favour of an oil boycott against South Africa based on the mandatory decision by the Security Council and has also expressed its support for the efforts of the oil-exporting and -producing countries to ensure the effective implementation of their voluntary embargo.

129. The Netherlands scrupulously adheres to the existing mandatory arms embargo established by Security Council resolution 418 (1977). As a member of the Security Council, the Netherlands has actively urged the adoption of measures to strengthen the embargo and to enhance its effectiveness, notably by a mandatory ban on the import of arms produced in South Africa. Furthermore, we fully subscribe to the demands enumerated in paragraph 4. With regard to the appeal made in paragraph 8, I wish to recall that

the Netherlands is a major donor of assistance to victims of *apartheid*, the front-line States and the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference, and we have extended support to the ANC and the PAC with the previously mentioned reservation. Yet we cannot endorse all aspects of the draft resolution. Some of our reservations are related to the general principles which I outlined earlier in my statement. We also have reservations concerning paragraph 7. We would welcome a mandatory decision by the Security Council to restrict investments in South Africa. However, in the sphere of national action, my Government does not wish to prejudge the outcome of its consultations with employer organizations and trade unions to consider in what way investments by Dutch companies in South Africa can be influenced as effectively as possible. Furthermore, the Netherlands shares the view that South Africa must be denied any military nuclear capability. But rather than an appeal to cease all nuclear co-operation with South Africa, we would have preferred a call on South Africa to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] or, alternatively, to accept full-scale safeguards on all its nuclear installations.

130. I now turn briefly to some of the remaining draft resolutions. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, in spite of reservations regarding certain elements in the Special Committee's report. In our view, the means for the implementation of this programme must be found within the resources of the regular budget.

131. Finally, the Netherlands will continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution concerning *apartheid* in sports. The introduction of visa requirements for South Africans has enabled my authorities, *inter alia*, to restrict South African participation in sporting events in the Netherlands. However, we cannot accept some provisions of the proposed international convention against *apartheid* because they are incompatible with certain constitutionally guaranteed freedoms in my country.

132. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on the policies of *apartheid* of the South African Government. These draft resolutions appear in documents A/39/L.28 to L.33 and L.36. We are also pleased to be one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/39/L.33, on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

133. Our firm support of these draft resolutions reflects our desire to take part in the efforts of the international community to eliminate *apartheid*. However, we do have reservations regarding some of the paragraphs in these draft resolutions. As regards draft resolution A/39/L.28, we believe that the thirteenth, twenty-first, twenty-second, twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 14 and 15 are not worded in a balanced manner.

134. Generally speaking, we do not think reference should be made to certain countries or groups of countries, since it is difficult to take a final stand on the respective responsibilities. More specifically, we have reservations as to references to Western countries, mentioned individually or as a group, in several paragraphs of the draft resolutions in question.

135. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): This morning my delegation voted against the motion introduced by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. We did so unhesitatingly. Our vote cannot be misinterpreted: the unreserved opposition of the Belgian Government and people to *apartheid* is well known to everyone. In the context in which this motion was introduced, it did not apply to the importance of the question of *apartheid*, but instead was a procedural ploy to obstruct the adoption of amendments submitted by a Member country after the rejection of another motion aimed at preventing a vote on those amendments. Such techniques are regrettable, for they undermine the effectiveness of the work and disrupt the atmosphere of the Assembly.

136. Draft resolutions A/39/L.29 and L.32, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and on public information and public action against *apartheid*, meet with the approval of my delegation, for we believe that everything should be done to ensure the proper allocation of available resources.

137. As regards specifically document A/39/L.29 on the programme of work of the Special Committee, the favourable vote of my delegation does not imply, as we would stress, full approval of the entire report referred to in the only preambular paragraph.

138. My delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.31, which concerns *apartheid* in sports, and of draft resolution A/39/L.33 on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

139. My delegation regrets that it is unable to vote in favour of the other three draft resolutions on the policies of *apartheid*. The representative of Ireland, in the statement just made on behalf of the member countries of the European Community, has already very clearly reflected the concerns of my country on this subject. Belgium unreservedly takes part in the universal condemnation of the system of *apartheid*, but we are all the less disposed to depart from our normal standards of conduct since the concessions that would thus be required do not seem to us likely to achieve the goals being pursued. Belgium cannot at one and the same time call for a peaceful solution and give direct or indirect encouragement to armed struggle. Our attitude is consistent and responsible, and in keeping, we believe, with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the mission of the Organization.

140. If the reactions of the Pretoria Government to the pressing appeals of the international community have been continually disappointing to us, my country still cannot subscribe to the statement that that Government, with the support of some Western countries, is pursuing a hegemonistic policy in southern Africa. We cannot accept individual criticism levelled at certain Western countries, in particular those who present a policy of constructive engagement, in an entirely negative manner. That is why my delegation would have voted in favour of the amendments introduced by the delegation of the United States if they had been maintained.

141. Belgium cannot agree that a special resolution should be devoted to relations between South Africa and another State for reasons not directly related to the problem of *apartheid*. My country remains convinced that the widespread boycott of South Africa would have effects contrary to those being sought

here by the international community and that the maintenance of channels of communication between it and the Government of South Africa is necessary if we want the weight of existing pressure to lead to a peaceful dismantling of the institutional structures of *apartheid.*

142. Finally, as regards the participation of specialized agencies in the struggle against *apartheid,* my delegation is more than ever convinced that in the permanent interest of international co-operation, their jurisdiction should remain essentially technical and their universal nature should not be undermined.

143. For these reasons, my delegation will be obliged to vote against draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and L.30, and we must abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/39/L.36, on concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid.* On the subject of this latter draft resolution, we recognize that an appreciable effort has been made by the sponsors to bring about a consensus. It is, however, the opinion of my Government that some of the language contained in this draft resolution continues to convey ideas which we cannot support.

144. Mr. CARLSON (Canada): My delegation opposed the Iranian motion. We do not consider the proposal consistent with the language and intent of Article 18 of the Charter of the United Nations. We are concerned that a regrettable precedent may have been established which could limit future debate and stifle the will of the majority of the membership.

145. The representative of Canada clearly outlined and enunciated my country's policy on the vital issue of *apartheid* at the 67th meeting. We will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.36 as a further demonstration of our total rejection of the system of *apartheid.* We also recognize that the text of this draft resolution has been carefully prepared to take into account various considerations. We congratulate the sponsors for their efforts.

146. My delegation must, nevertheless, register its reservations with respect to some elements of this resolution. Regarding paragraph 5, Canada supports effective measures to eliminate *apartheid* and recognizes the right of the Security Council, under the Charter of the United Nations, to decide questions regarding mandatory sanctions. It is not readily apparent to us which new forms of mandatory sanctions might be relevant or effective at this time. For this reason, we have some doubts about the timeliness of this recommendation.

147. Regarding paragraph 7, the Canadian Government does not lend funds or extend official credit to South Africa. A series of measures has been taken to terminate the official promotion of trade, including the end of export credits and the abrogation of the Canada-South African trade agreement. These measures do not prevent, by law, Canadian individuals or companies from pursuing trade in peaceful goods or pursuing investment opportunities. That is a matter for individual judgement.

148. Regarding paragraph 8, Canada does not support armed struggle as a means to effect change in South Africa. We do, however, extend considerable financial help to the victims of *apartheid* inside South Africa and to refugees. Grants are accorded to voluntary organizations supporting community development and training. Exiles are assisted through the Commonwealth, the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, UNDP and other means. We do not support, or intend to support, movements which seek to achieve their objectives through violent means.

149. Regarding paragraph 9, while we reject initiatives and contacts that would support the *apartheid* régime, we do not consider that open and frank exchanges have, or need to have, this effect. We do not favour the complete isolation of South Africa and do not interpret this paragraph, as worded, to endorse the termination of all contacts. Societies which are isolated find it more difficult to change. We do not change peoples' minds by refusing to talk to them.

150. This having been said, the Canadian delegation wishes to emphasize once again that we fully support the evident intent of this resolution, which is to muster support for concerted international action. The struggle against *apartheid* is one which we espouse. It must be continued until *apartheid* is ended and there is justice for all.

Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

151. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): I have already explained the Australian delegation's opposition to the Iranian motion this morning, and I wish now to address briefly the draft resolution before us. As my delegation stated in the general debate on this item [*67th meeting*], the present Australian Government totally rejects all forms of *apartheid,* all forms of racism and, in particular, the repugnant policy of *apartheid.*

152. My Government views *apartheid* as the root cause of the tensions, instability and confrontation in southern Africa. Australia therefore supports international efforts to censure South Africa where these have the support of the international community and is prepared to take measures to bring effective pressures to bear on South Africa to end *apartheid.*

153. Despite our strong support for effective international action to terminate *apartheid,* we find ourselves once again faced with a number of resolutions containing elements which we are unable to accept. It was for this reason that my delegation welcomed the opportunity to co-operate with a number of other Western and African delegations in sponsoring draft resolution A/39/L.36, which we believe contains an effective blueprint for action against *apartheid.* In relation to the other resolutions, I wish to make the following observations.

154. My delegation is opposed to the endorsement of armed struggle as a means of bringing about an end to *apartheid.* The settlement of disputes by peaceful means is one of the most cherished principles of the United Nations, and we do not believe that it is appropriate to endorse armed struggle.

155. Having said this, however, I should add that, as I said yesterday [*97th meeting*] in respect of Namibia, we do understand the frustrations that have led many countries and peoples to take the view that if peaceful methods do not produce the necessary results, force may inevitably occur as a last resort to end institutionalized discrimination in southern Africa.

156. We are also opposed to the selective and arbitrary condemnation of individual Member States and to the often extravagant language in which these criticisms are voiced. For this reason, we would have voted in favour of the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.43 and L.44, and for that reason

we shall vote against those paragraphs on which the United States has requested a separate vote.

157. The Australian delegation is also committed to the principle of universality of membership of international organizations, and we cannot accept the calls in these resolutions for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations and its family of organizations. It is through its participation in such bodies that South Africa can be brought face-to-face with the full strength of international opposition to *apartheid*.

158. A further element in these draft resolutions which my delegation is not able to accept is the proclamation of South African liberation movements as the authentic representatives of the people of South Africa. Only free democratic elections based on universal suffrage can really determine who represents the people of South Africa.

159. Consistent with the attitude of the Australian delegation in relation to the need for strict control of United Nations expenditures, we also have some reservations about the nature and extent of the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

160. The presence of these elements in a number of the draft resolutions before us has meant that my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/39/L.28 and will vote against draft resolution A/39/L.30. We shall, however, vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.29, L.31 to L.33 and L.36.

161. Ms. MOSELE (Botswana): My delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/39/L.28 and will vote in favour of the rest of the draft resolutions under consideration, while reserving our position on any of their paragraphs which enjoin us to participate in the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa. We are not in a position to support the imposition of economic sanctions, let alone an oil embargo, against South Africa.

162. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): My delegation as a matter of principle fully supports all United Nations efforts to put an end to the inhuman practices of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa. Therefore my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions now before us. However, in view of our usual position regarding our difficulties over sanctions, my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/39/L.28. It follows, therefore, that my delegation has difficulties with paragraphs pertaining to sanctions in other draft resolutions, as Lesotho is not in a position to implement them.

163. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): As we stated in the course of the debate on the agenda item before us [*69th meeting*], Israel categorically and unequivocally rejects racism, racial discrimination, bigotry and intolerance in any form. This position has been made clear by us on numerous occasions in the Assembly. It has also been repeatedly communicated by us to the Government of South Africa. Nevertheless, the sponsors of draft resolution A/39/L.30, as well as of some of the other draft resolutions before us, have intentionally ignored official communiqués from my Government which are contained in official documents of the United Nations and have prepared to rely on mendacious, tendentious and unsubstantiated allegations based on speculative press reports and on previous one-sided resolutions. In so doing, the sponsors of these draft resolutions have sought to divert attention from the real problems of *apartheid*, thus gravely undermining the purpose of the debate on this subject and subverting the genuine concern for the victims of bigotry and racial prejudice.

164. It is high time for a serious assessment of the relentless perennial incantations against my country to take place and for a single, honest and impartial standard to be set and applied with regard to the just struggle against racism and racial discrimination in all its manifestations. Israel has once again been singled out in this item as the only country in the world for specific condemnation based on patent falsehoods. For this reason, as for other reasons raised by my delegation on previous occasions, the delegation of Israel will vote negatively on draft resolution A/39/L.30.

165. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): The representative of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community, has already expressed views shared by my Government and I need therefore comment only briefly on why the United Kingdom does not feel able to support most of the draft resolutions now before the Assembly.

166. No member of the Assembly can be in any doubt of the strength of opposition of successive British Governments to *apartheid* or of the efforts they have made consistently, through pressure and persuasion by all available means, to induce the South African Government to abandon the cruel, morally unacceptable and degrading system of *apartheid*. But, as we have consistently made clear at recent sessions of the General Assembly, we had hoped that this body would approach the *apartheid* question in a realistic and effective manner and work for draft resolutions that would allow all delegations to express their unanimous opposition to *apartheid*. We are saddened that the impact of the draft resolutions adopted has been diminished by their being used for manifestly divisive ends. The effectiveness of the Assembly's efforts to oppose *apartheid* would be enormously enhanced if the position of some Member States were not misrepresented or abused and if strict regard were paid to the truth.

167. For example, with regard to draft resolution A/39/L.29, we particularly regret the nature of the report presented to the Assembly by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22*]. The report is slanted, inaccurate and in several places seriously misrepresents my Government's position. It contains an extraordinary number of tendentious attacks upon Member States, including the United Kingdom and several of our partners in the European Community. It will be entirely counterproductive, as it can bring comfort only to those who do not genuinely wish to see the problems of South Africa resolved rapidly, justly and without further bloodshed. Similar considerations apply to draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and L.30.

168. The most effective way in which the international community can assist the people of South Africa to dismantle *apartheid* lies not through isolation, comprehensive sanctions or other measures which would entrench the South African Government's stance and have serious consequences for neighbouring countries, still less through violence, but through the maintenance of dialogue and channels of communication. Through these channels my Government will continue to impress upon the South African Government our unwavering refusal to tolerate *apartheid*.

169. Mr. PHIRI (Malawi): In considering the draft resolutions before the plenary Assembly, my delegation would like to reiterate that the Government of the Republic of Malawi remains resolutely averse to the policies of *apartheid* and all the methods used to enforce them.

170. On 23 October last, the President of my country and the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique issued a joint communiqué in which they unreservedly condemned the practice of *apartheid* in South Africa and called for an early end to the *apartheid* policies.

171. My Government's rejection of the policies of *apartheid* cannot therefore be in doubt. It was in support of this aversion to *apartheid* that my delegation voted in favour of the Iranian motion. However, my delegation holds the view that some of the measures called for in the draft resolutions under consideration may not contribute to the early achievement of our objective of eliminating *apartheid*. Moreover, my delegation joins those delegations that hold the conviction that the problems we are facing require practical approaches that are implementable.

172. We wish to reiterate that we do not support the practice of singling out a few Member States for condemnation or criticism, which is in conflict with the principle of universality. We all know that published records point to several other Member States that would be candidates for any such criticism in this regard.

173. In these circumstances, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.29 and L.31 to L.33, but will abstain on draft resolutions A/39/L.28, L.30 and L.36.

174. My delegation's abstention in the votes on those draft resolutions is the result of historical and geographical factors over which my country has no control.

175. My delegation finds it difficult to reconcile the idea that many countries deal directly or indirectly with South Africa and yet are not singled out for mention or condemnation.

176. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to appeal to the Government of South Africa to establish constructive dialogue and fruitful communication with the black majority in South Africa.

177. Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): In the vote on the Iranian motion this morning, Sri Lanka voted in favour because we hold that the question of *apartheid* is of the utmost importance. We must reiterate that it is our firm view that every Member of the Organization has an equal right to be heard in the Assembly, and if it deems it necessary, to introduce resolutions and seek amendments.

178. My delegation firmly supports the thrust of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/39/L.28 to L.33 and L.36. We intend to vote in favour of all those draft resolutions when each of them is put to the vote as a whole.

179. Sri Lanka's consistent policy at the United Nations on all issues has been that we have not favoured the condemnation or denunciation by name of countries with which we have diplomatic relations. Our carrying out that policy in United Nations voting, however, does not imply any diminution of our strong opposition to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, as indicated in our statement in the general debate on this item [*67th meeting*].

180. Sri Lanka will not be able to support the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/39/L.28—on which separate votes have now been requested—in view of its consistent policy.

181. Mr. KAM (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The policy of *apartheid* of the racist régime in South Africa has been condemned and categorically rejected by my country in the United Nations and other international forums. We have never balked at describing *apartheid* as a crime against humanity and a disgrace to the human race, since Panama is a country which is a model crucible of races living together in harmony.

182. We reaffirm our support to the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movements in their just struggle to eliminate *apartheid* and bring about a democratic, non-racial society which guarantees human rights and fundamental freedoms for the whole population.

183. We should like to reiterate our support for the ANC and the PAC in their heroic struggle against the racist minority régime in South Africa to bring about the total elimination of *apartheid* and transform South Africa into a democratic society, free from racism and discrimination.

184. My delegation reiterates its solidarity with the front-line States and expresses its gratitude for the valuable contribution they have made to the struggle against the racist régime in South Africa and for elimination of colonialism in Africa.

185. We believe that the repeated acts of aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against independent African States, the persistence and recrudescence of its policy of oppression against the people of South Africa and its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, represent serious threats to international peace and security. That is why an end should be put to those policies.

186. In the light of what I have just said, we shall vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.28, L.29, L.31 to L.33 and L.36, which essentially are in keeping with my country's foreign policy in this respect. Nevertheless, we would like to enter reservations in connection with certain paragraphs that are drafted in such a way as to make selective condemnations by naming countries with which Panama has diplomatic relations.

187. In the light of that latter comment, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.30. However, our abstention and reservations should not in any way be construed as any kind of approval for or consent to the sort of collaboration that many countries undertake with the racist régime in South Africa, which strengthens that régime and encourages it in its policies of *apartheid* and oppression

188. I should like to explain my delegation's vote this morning in connection with the proposal made by the representative of Iran requesting a two-thirds majority to approve draft resolutions or amendments on the question of *apartheid*. We want to make it abundantly clear that *apartheid* is an important question for the United Nations and the entire international community. That is why a substantive consideration of this matter should deserve the

highest priority in the Organization and be dealt with in the most serious way possible.

189. We consider that the context in which the vote was taken this morning was not the most appropriate one for delegations clearly to state their position on whether the definition of *apartheid* should be regarded as an important question in the United Nations. On the contrary, it was somewhat damaging to the unanimous expression of the political will of our countries in this matter, because the question was linked with procedural matters and the vote was affected by amendments proposed by the United States before the decision was taken.

190. We think it was counterproductive for the Iranian motion to have been put forward at the time it was, since it gave the impression that it would directly affect the voting process on the United States amendments and that we were not following the relevant rules.

191. We have no doubt about the substance of the issue; nevertheless, since we had very serious reservations about the propriety and intentions underlying the Iranian proposal, my delegation abstained thereon.

192. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to reiterate its position of principle: it rejects racial discrimination and any form of *apartheid*. Nevertheless, we regret that in some of the draft resolutions before us elements were introduced that are extraneous to the fundamental principles that must inspire us—that is, the reaffirmation of our rejection of *apartheid*, whatever form it may take.

193. In certain paragraphs of some of these draft resolutions it appears that a selective criterion was used which does not contribute to our common goal in this matter, but rather tends to politicize a problem with deep underlying humanitarian concerns. That is why my delegation hopes that in the future such paragraphs which imperil a consensus will disappear so that unanimous support in the condemnation of all forms of *apartheid* is possible.

194. Mr. BERMUDEZ (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.28, L.29, L.31 to L.33 and L.36 on the policy of *apartheid* followed by the Government of South Africa. Honduras is categorically opposed both to this policy of oppression, which is an enemy of social coexistence, and to any resort to violence, either domestic or international, including oppression or terrorism in any part of the world.

195. Nevertheless, as we stated on 5 December last year, and indeed yesterday in explaining our vote on the question of Namibia [*97th meeting*], we cannot support selective references directed against States other than South Africa. That is why Honduras will vote in favour of the deletion of those specific references in the paragraphs concerned and will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/39/L.30.

196. Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): Yesterday, and once again today, we have been confronted by situations which at least have had the merit of revealing clearly the fierce stubbornness of certain countries with regard to accepting the way the world is developing. How can we explain otherwise the fact that yesterday the international community, amnesiac since 11 October 1954, miraculously found its memory and realized that it had adopted resolution 844 (IX)? How can we otherwise explain what delegations are pleased to call "procedural wrangles" if we were not prompted by the sole desire to overcome others and bring them to their knees? How can we explain that in the same situation this morning we were faced by two procedural motions; and furthermore, one of these motions, in the eyes of my delegation at least, concerned a false problem?

197. In fact, it is not up to the Assembly to determine whether the question of *apartheid* is important or not. We all condemn *apartheid*, and the international community has judged it to be such a serious practice, therefore so important, that it has termed it a crime against humanity.

198. My country, Togo, has always condemned, condemns and will always condemn *apartheid*. My delegation views this as such a serious issue that it believes it is not through certain procedural manoeuvres that we should effect a determination as to whether this is an important question or not, all the more because this is not the first time that the General Assembly has considered this item. We have always dealt with it according to rules which should not suddenly be reversed or altered the way they have been.

199. For my delegation, the second motion this morning seemed to be a calculated political artifice underlying a procedural motion, the clear purpose of which was to prevent all those struggling against *apartheid* from obtaining the required majority to condemn this odious practice. Furthermore, in the eyes of my delegation this issue is of such importance that it is constantly being discussed at all levels. It is essentially a human problem. Therefore, we cannot reasonably expect that a question of daily life, a problem of human existence, should become an important political issue in the sense of being an important question as defined in Article 18 of the Charter of the United Nations. For all these reasons, my delegation voted against the procedural motion of Iran.

200. The matter of *apartheid* is of concern to us all. Various approaches have been adopted in order to try to end this scourge. Account has to be taken of how the situation has developed to try to determine the best strategy to be used hereafter. This is what has been requested by certain States.

201. For its part, the delegation of Togo does not believe it necessarily follows that simply because a certain country has taken a certain attitude in the past, it will always have the same attitude now or in the future. Politics is essentially a question of human beings, and given that human beings are in a constant state of change, it is quite conceivable that politics can vary in one way or another according to what is going on in the political world, the foundation of which is defending interests, which are, in this particular case, a common interest—that is, the battle against *apartheid*.

202. Instead of fighting each other in "procedural battles", let us face up squarely to the actual situation in the world and ask if we are really doing the right thing to solve the question of *apartheid*. Let us indeed condemn all those countries which collaborate with the South African racist régime. Let us not be selective in our approach; let us condemn all those States, if that is our intention.

203. The Government of Togo is convinced that no country should be named unless an exhaustive list

can be given of all countries which collaborate with South Africa. That is a question of justice.

204. In the light of all that I have said, therefore, my delegation will give favourable consideration to the United States position on the vote which we are about to take.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

205. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): The Bahamas delegation did not participate in the procedural vote this morning regarding the importance of the question of *apartheid* since it is convinced that having to take a decision on such an obvious and fundamental fact can only serve to diminish its importance and significance.

206. The Bahamas delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.29 to L.32 and L.36 and will abstain on L.28.

207. The Bahamas delegation remains committed to the just and legitimate cause of the black majority of South Africa attempting to free itself from the bondage of *apartheid,* which the General Assembly has justly labelled a crime against humanity. It notes with concern, however, that the determined struggle of the black majority continues to be countered by calculated initiatives on the part of the Government of Pretoria to strengthen its ruthless, baseless policy of racial segregation and hatred, in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions and decisions of the Organization.

208. Its most recent act of defiance and contempt, the so-called new constitution, serves only to clarify the intent of that racist régime to exclude the black majority from participation in all areas, including the political arena, and to ensure that total power remains concentrated in the hands of the white minority. The new constitution, an old policy in poor disguise, has not deceived the community of nations. It merely enforces bantustanization, repression and economic, political and cultural deprivation as the only realities for the black majority of South Africa.

209. The frustration of the majority of the international community with South Africa's continued intransigence regarding international standards and principles and the determination to challenge the system of *apartheid* until it is dismantled and replaced by a just, multiracial society are, the Bahamas believes, reflected in the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

210. Based on what it perceives its obligation and that of the international community to be, the Bahamas reiterates its solidarity with the black majority of South Africa and its confidence in United Nations efforts for this just cause. It therefore supports the thrust of the draft resolutions, in particular those provisions which call for continued material and moral support for the oppressed people of South Africa and for non-involvement with South Africa in the economic, military, political and cultural spheres.

211. Yet the Bahamas has always held, and continues to hold, that greater progress is achieved with less confrontation and more co-operation, which can be achieved through genuine understanding, good intentions and political will. The struggle should not be between opposing sides in the Assembly; rather, the international community as a whole should seek to implement decisions taken against the racist régime of South Africa. It therefore appeals to sponsors and opposers of draft resolutions submitted for adoption to search for a more selfless approach to the structure of future texts, for without a serious revision of the position taken on all sides there can be no appreciable solution to this tormenting problem.

212. Despite the affirmative vote of my delegation for the draft resolutions mentioned, the Bahamas reiterates for the record its concern over the language and formulation of draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and L.30 in particular. The former has several conflicting elements and selective naming of States detracts from its efficacy; the latter, because of its lack of balance, is less constructive. Nevertheless, this observation does not detract from support for the main thrust of the texts, which call attention to the root cause of the evil of *apartheid.* My delegation trusts that majority support will serve as a catalyst in bringing about positive developments on the question in the future.

213. Mr. ZAIN (Malaysia): This morning, my delegation voted in favour of the procedural motion presented by the delegation of Iran. In the circumstances that prevailed at the meeting, my delegation did not have the opportunity to examine the matter in all its underlying ramifications and complexities and, above all, its implication for the struggle against *apartheid* itself and for wider support for the liberation movements in South Africa. We voted in favour because obviously *apartheid* is an important question and has been so regarded.

214. Certainly the opposition of the Malaysian Government to the policies of *apartheid*—the contemporary version of nazism, as we have called it—ever since our independence has been total, complete and unequivocal. Bearing in mind, however, the particular context in which the proposal was put forward, my delegation wishes it to go on record that our position on that voting should now be read as non-participation.

215. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): We have got only this planet. The super-Powers might have thought of going to their satellites, but we have no satellites, and since we have only this planet, we have to live on it peacefully, if we want to live at all.

216. We strongly adhere to and believe in justice, peace and fairness—what the representative of the United States pleads for. We, too, believe in resolving differences peacefully, but from the start, not when the enemy has exhausted all its unpeaceful means, because then there is no peace to talk about. We do not think that those who have the military power to intimidate each one of us individually and even collectively, as the United States representative did this morning, can present a fair definition of fairness. That the super-Powers can intimidate those who disagree with their definition of fairness is not really fair at all.

217. We think the oppressed—the South Africans, the Angolans, the Palestinians, the Ethiopians—the barefoot and the hungry, are more sincere in their plea for fairness than those that have the atomic bombs, supersonic aircraft and all the deadly weapons with which to impose their fairness on others. I have a few questions to ask both super-Powers. When have they been fair at all, and where? On what basis are they making appeals for fairness? Is it not true that it is always the third world countries which have asked for fairness? Is it not true that the Group of 77, in its negotiations on the transfer of technology and

other subjects, called for fairness? Have we attained any at all?

218. We, too, believe in fairness, but we think the definition of fairness, from the super-Powers to the third-world countries, changes significantly. That is why what those that have all the means of imposing their opinions upon others consider fair might seem absolutely unfair to us.

219. My delegation, therefore, will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.28, L.33 and L.36, on the basis of fairness. I also make this very important commitment: whenever we observe a basic change in the foreign policy of the United States towards the South African indigenous population, we shall be the first to propose to delete all those phrases condemning the United States for its co-operation with South Africa. Therefore, inasmuch as the policies of the United States are as they are, I think our position remains as it is.

220. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): Cancer, heart disease, sickle cell anaemia and other dreaded diseases kill, cripple and destroy without warning. They strike at their immediate victims and at those who love, cherish and respect victims of those dreaded diseases. Condemning these plagues upon mankind is not enough. All of us recognize the need to support and fund research into the causes of and cures for these ailments. No one would today argue that we have done enough in this regard; nor can anyone say that merely condemning *apartheid* is enough.

221. *Apartheid* is also a cancer. It is a sickness as vile and serious as any of the other diseases that kill, maim, destroy and prevent human beings from realizing their full potential.

222. It is our belief that no effort should be spared in examining the causes of and searching for cures for this perverse illness. Just as we are not prepared to tie the hands of medical researchers engaged in battle against medical disease or restrict the resources available to them, we are similarly not prepared to tie the hands or restrict the efforts of those engaged in the struggle against the social and political disease called *apartheid*. We and the vast majority of the States represented here love, cherish and respect the people of South Africa as we love, cherish and respect all peoples. Therefore, we will vote in favour of the draft resolutions on *apartheid*.

223. Just as one cannot truly comprehend the pain and suffering of the terminally ill, we do not believe that any of us can truly comprehend the magnitude and extent of the pain and suffering endured by the vast majority of South Africa's people. To them there is no such thing as inappropriate language with respect to the excesses of the Pretoria régime. To them our word will never be as strong as the police state which confronts their existence every single minute of every single day. To them the least—and it is the very least—we can do, all of us, is to distance ourselves even further from the greatest example of inhumanity existing today.

224. While we might have chosen different language in some sections of the draft resolutions, we feel that this is relatively unimportant in the larger picture. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* is charged with primary responsibility in this area, and if its language is less than perfect, at least its effort, its compassion and its commitment are exemplary. We commend its chairman for his zeal and vigorous advocacy on behalf of all human beings.

225. We believe that the international community has over the years shown considerable restraint and been very accommodating. Who here today could possibly dare to suggest that Pretoria has responded in kind? Who here today could possibly suggest that we have done enough to combat *apartheid* or that we have tried everything we can? Let us not forget that every gesture or concession made to South Africa has been taken by that régime as an act of acquiescence or a sign of approval. That régime's arrogance has bred an almost unparalleled myopia. It does not believe that we really mean what we say when we condemn *apartheid*. We have heard the voices of those who will not be able to support these draft resolutions. We understand their difficulties. However, we have also heard the voice of South Africa's people. Their difficulty is even easier to understand, for we speak the same language and share the same dreams and the same frustrations. We trust that those who cannot support the draft resolutions will understand our need to support them.

226. Once again we state that we are voting not against any other State, but against the Republic of South Africa and its *apartheid* policies. Let no one be mistaken: it is relatively easy to engage in verbal denunciations of *apartheid*. Any of us can do that. What we must do now is take a step, no matter how small, and signal some sign of hope to South Africa's embattled people.

227. Perhaps the draft resolutions are in some aspects too selective, but at some point in time the search for a cure for any disease must focus somewhere. In this case we might not agree with all of the emphasis, and we would prefer a broader scope. We will work for a wider and more precise focus in the future, but we are most certainly not prepared now to sit on the sidelines and thereby acquiesce in an erosion of support for those who stand most firmly against the sickness of *apartheid* and, symbolically, in the front lines as soldiers of the United Nations.

228. Mr. MOSELEY (Barbados): My delegation, as a general principle is opposed to selective name-calling, since this tends to exacerbate rather than to conciliate. We feel that the absence of conciliation is contrary to the spirit and intent of the Charter of the United Nations. Logically, therefore, intemperate language combined with selective name-calling is more likely to be counter-productive than otherwise. If the aim is to defeat *apartheid*, then clearly the appropriate strategy must be to mobilize all resources for the fight.

229. My delegation has very serious doubts as to the extent to which Member States trade with South Africa. What States, for example, sell oil to South Africa, purchase diamonds from South Africa and otherwise bolster the South African economy? Why single out one or two Member States?

230. But there is another side of the coin. Where selective name-calling occurs, my delegation deplores it as a serious blemish and an unfair tactic. However, where the evil complained of is not enough to vitiate a resolution as a whole, then so keenly does my country feel about the question of *apartheid* that my delegation can go no further than to abstain. Inevitably there will be difficulties. Thus my delegation, although supporting the main thrust of the draft resolutions as a whole, must register its very great dissatisfaction at the biased and intemperate language that appears in the twenty-sixth preambular

paragraph of the draft resolution contained in A/39/L.28. We cannot support the policy of constructive engagement, but we cannot in all conscience attribute to that policy the vices recited in the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph. My delegation will support the draft resolutions, but with reservations as to certain paragraphs.

231. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting. Before proceeding to the vote, I would like to announce that other states have become sponsors of draft resolutions on the question of *apartheid:* draft resolution A/39/L.28: 5 states; draft resolution A/39/L.29: 11 states; draft resolution A/39/L.30: 8 states; draft resolution A/39/L.31: 13 states; draft resolution A/39/L.32: 12 states; draft resolution A/39/L.33: 5 states; draft resolution A/39/L.36: 7 states.

232. The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on the various draft resolutions. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of these draft resolutions is contained in document A/39/787.

233. We turn first to draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add. 1, entitled "Comprehensive sanctions against the *apartheid* régime and support to the liberation struggle in South Africa". In this connection, I wish to inform Members that in his introductory statement made at this morning's plenary meeting, the representative of Nigeria, in his capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid,* revised the last part of paragraph 31 of draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add. 1, by deleting the following words: "and, in particular, to exclude South Africa from all its technical working groups".

234. I should like to remind Members that the representative of the United States of America has formally moved that the Assembly proceed to hold separate votes on the following paragraphs: the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph, paragraphs 15 and 18 of draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add. 1, as well as the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/39/L.30 and Add. 1.

235. In this connection, I should like to quote rule 89 of the General Assembly rules of procedure:

> "A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment should be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are approved shall then be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole."

236. If I hear no objection, the Assembly will vote separately on the aforementioned paragraphs.

237. I shall first put to the vote the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add. 1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Jamaica, Lebanon, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela, Zaire.

There were 57 votes in favour, 54 against and 31 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was not adopted.

238. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen[4], Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Saint Christopher and

Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela, Zaire.

There were 59 votes in favour, 57 against and 26 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, paragraph 15 of the draft resolution was not adopted.

239. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote paragraph 18 of draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Lebanon, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

There were 62 votes in favour, 47 against and 29 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, paragraph 18 of the draft resolution was not adopted.

240. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1, as a whole, as amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Botswana, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 123 votes to 15, with 15 abstentions (resolution 39/72 A).

241. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will vote next on draft resolution A/39/L.29, and Add.1 entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 152 votes to 2 (resolution 39/72B).

242. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will vote next on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/39/L.30 and Add.1, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa." A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Burma, Gabon, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 65 votes in favour, 55 against and 17 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was not adopted.

243. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/39/L.30 and Add.1, as a whole, as amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Barbados, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Uruguay.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 108 votes to 19, with 25 abstentions (resolution 39/72 C).

244. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now begin the voting process on draft resolution A/39/L.31 and Add.1 entitled, "*Apartheid* in sports", and the amendment thereto contained in document A/39/L.41.

245. In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly will first vote on the amendment relating to a new paragraph 2. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The amendment to the draft resolution was adopted by 147 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

246. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote draft resolution A/39/L.31 and Add.1, as a whole, as amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 148 votes to none, with 6 abstentions (resolution 39/72 D).

247. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution A/39/L.32 and Add.1, entitled "Public information and public action against *apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 152 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 39/72 E).

248. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/39/L.33 and Add.1, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". Since there is no request for a vote, I shall consider that the General Assembly decides to adopt that draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/72 F).

249. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/39/L.36 and Add.1, enti-

tled "Concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi.

The draft resolution was adopted by 146 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions (resolution 39/72 G).

250. The PRESIDENT: In the light of the decisions just taken by the General Assembly, the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, Mr. Garba of Nigeria, has asked to make a statement. I take it that there is no objection to my calling on him.

251. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria), Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid:* It has been traditional for the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to make a statement at the conclusion of the discussion of *apartheid* in the Assembly. I know that there are some delegations which wish to explain their vote, but I do have some very pressing engagements and I am grateful that you have allowed me to speak at this time.

252. First of all, I should like to express my gratitude to the many delegations here for their kind words about the work of the Special Committee. I am also gratified at the appreciation expressed by the General Assembly for the efficient and devoted services by the staff of the Centre against *Apartheid*.

253. Secondly, I must say that I am distressed that the General Assembly has been diverted for some time from addressing the main problem before us, namely, the grave situation in South Africa and the responsibility of those who have allowed the *apartheid* régime to become a menace to the world.

254. This morning I proposed that the Assembly avoid unnecessary divisive votes. There was no need to vote on amendments when the Assembly could vote on provisions of the draft resolutions and each delegation could record his views. I regret that we did not have the time to explain our view to all delegations, but let me say that I had no intention of preventing a fair vote. In fact, it is important that the oppressed people of South Africa and the whole world should know the attitude of the United States and its supporters.

255. The oppressed people of South Africa are observing Christmas this year as "black Christmas" in order to mourn for the hundreds of men, women and children who have been killed and the many others who have been maimed by the racist police.

256. They cannot celebrate the joyous season because they have faced and continue to face untold suffering because they reject, as every decent person must, the evil system of *apartheid*. Their leaders are in prison, and eight courageous leaders of the United Democratic Front have just been charged with high treason. Thousands of workers have been summarily dismissed and deported, and whole communities have been devastated.

257. By choosing to suffer in struggle rather than surrender to racism, they are fighting not only for their own freedom and the future of all the people of South Africa, but for the purposes and principles of the Organization. They do not ask for pity, but they demand and deserve our solidarity.

258. But the issue is wider than that.

259. The racist clique in Pretoria is arrogant with power. After its largest military manoeuvres last September, its so-called Minister of Defence boasted, "With what we witnessed yesterday we could go right through to Cairo".

260. The struggle against *apartheid* is not merely a struggle of the black people of South Africa, but the struggle of Africa for self-defence and of the United Nations for international peace and security.

261. No amount of equivocation and propaganda and no lobbying and pressure in the Assembly can cancel out before history the responsibility of those who have sustained the *apartheid* régime with military, economic and political support and, indeed, protection.

262. We know, and the oppressed people of South Africa know, that we have a difficult task. But the oppressed people of South Africa will fight, and Africa will fight, despite the temporary difficulties we now face, until South Africa is liberated, whatever the odds, because we have no choice.

263. We seek the support of all Governments and all men and women of conscience, and we expect support because our cause is just.

264. The draft resolutions adopted today must not remain just paper but should lead to action.

265. Let me make special mention of the draft resolution on concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid*, which has been adopted by an overwhelming vote. I should like to thank the Nordic and other Western countries which have cosponsored this draft resolution as an act of faith and a demonstration of their commitment.

266. This resolution is above all a commitment for action, and I trust that all Governments which voted in favour will give urgent attention to the implementation of its provisions.

267. I appeal to those who today failed to vote in favour to reconsider their attitudes. I appeal to public opinion, especially in Western countries, to lend its support to the resolution, which represents a minimum of action that is urgently required.

268. The Special Committee against *Apartheid,* while holding extensive consultations with Governments to encourage them to take action, will continue to devote special attention to reaching the people at the grass-roots level and the leaders of public opinion—political and religious leaders, cultural personalities, sportsmen and others—to persuade them to join the campaign of conscience and action against *apartheid.*

269. We are greatly encouraged by the response this year, and we wish to express our appreciation to the many Governments, organizations and individuals concerned. I would like again to commend Sweden for its initiative in strengthening its law against new investments in South Africa, and I hope that other countries concerned will consider similar action.

270. I cannot fail to express our great appreciation of the actions taken by the Government of New Zealand, under the leadership of Prime Minister David Lange. Actions like these send clear signals to the people of South Africa.

271. But I am even more encouraged by actions being taken daily by cities and States, by trade unions and religious bodies, by students and faculties, by universities and other institutions and by individuals all over the world. I have in mind the tens of thousands of people who demonstrated against Botha's visit to Europe, the shop-workers in Dublin who have been on picket lines for six months because they refuse to sell South African goods, the dock-workers who refuse to unload South African exports, sportsmen and singers who reject offers of *apartheid* blood money. I have in mind the thousands of Americans who are demonstrating in front of the *apartheid* régime's offices in the United States and the many leaders who have gone to gaol demanding the liberation of South African leaders and an end to collusion with *apartheid.*

272. I trust that these actions of conscience will soon develop into a world-wide movement powerful enough to fulfil the purposes of the United Nations and enable the people of South Africa to attain their liberation.

273. At this session, the General Assembly has made a very significant decision by declaring at last that *apartheid* is an important matter.

274. As I indicated at the beginning of this debate, the title of the agenda item is anachronistic. We can no more speak of the "Government" of South Africa, for there is no Government in that land, but an illegitimate, illegal and criminal racist clique of oppressors. The issue is the destruction of *apartheid* and the liberation of South Africa.

275. As an African, I am all too conscious of the difficulties that our continent faces today. But let no one take advantage of that and perpetuate the humiliation of Africa. I have no doubt that the people of Africa will rather starve than accept humiliation of black men and women.

276. I appeal to you, Mr. President, and everyone here for solidarity at this critical time. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* for its part pledges its utmost efforts to promote concerted action by Governments and peoples in the noble cause of eliminating one of the gravest affronts to human dignity, to enable the people of South Africa to establish a non-racial, democratic society and to help the continent of Africa to complete its emancipation.

277. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

278. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The delegation of Finland did not vote against draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1; yet I must emphasize that we have strong reservations on several of its paragraphs. Paragraphs 10 and 29 are contradictory to the principle of the universality of membership of the Organization. The same is true of paragraph 11. They are not in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations on the mandate of the Security Council. Our views on the recommendation of armed struggle are well known.

279. We are also, as a matter of principle, against singling out some Member States. We deeply regret that this year the resolution seems to include an increased number of references totally unacceptable to many delegations. We do not believe that a resolution of this kind will enhance the chances for success in our common struggle against the evil of *apartheid.*

280. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): Austria has consistently condemned the policy of *apartheid* as a particularly grave violation of human rights. We believe that it is a continuing challenge to the United Nations to contribute to the elimination of that abhorrent system of racial discrimination. For those reasons, we find ourselves in agreement with the general thrust of the texts submitted under this item.

281. However, there are a number of provisions in the draft resolutions which Austria cannot support. In particular, it has always been our position that the United Nations should concentrate all its efforts on bringing about political and social change by peaceful means and should not endorse armed struggle. We also oppose any provision which runs counter to the goal of universality of membership in the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Moreover, Austria believes that the General Assembly should respect the prerogatives of the Security Council with regard to coercive measures and therefore we cannot support any provisions which could be understood as an obligation to curtail relations with South Africa. We also wish to reiterate once again Austria's view that the arbitrary singling out of Member States in General Assembly resolutions is unjustified and does not promote the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa.

282. In the light of those considerations, the Austrian delegation had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1 and vote against draft resolution A/39/L.30 and Add.1. However, we took a positive position on draft resolutions A/39/L.29 and Add.1, L.31 and Add.1, L.32 and Add.1 and L.33 and Add.1. In view of our strong opposition to *apartheid,* we also supported draft resolution A/39/L.36 and Add.1, in spite of reservations regarding some of its formulations in the operative part. Our vote on these draft resolutions is meant as an expression of our full support for the

efforts to achieve a just and democratic society in South Africa based on the equal participation of all South Africans, regardless of the colour of their skin.

283. In conclusion, let me briefly explain our vote on the procedural motion that *apartheid* should be considered an important question. As far as the substance of the issue is concerned, we fully share the view that *apartheid* is indeed an extremely important question deserving special attention. In fact, it has always been considered as such by the international community. But, as a tactical manoeuvre, we had to oppose the proposal, since it is not in line with the requirements of equal and fair treatment of all amendments and proposals submitted by Member States.

284. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I should like to explain the vote of the Irish delegation on the draft resolutions on the policies of *apartheid* which were placed before us today.

285. Ireland's attitude to *apartheid* has been expressed on many occasions in the Assembly. My Government considers that the policies of institutionalized racial discrimination practised by white South Africa are morally wrong; they are dangerous; they cause immense human suffering; and they directly contradict the fundamental values which we hold. Ireland does not have diplomatic relations with South Africa, nor do we have trade agreements, economic co-operation or cultural agreements with it. It is the policy of the Irish Government not to seek through official actions to promote trade with South Africa, and it has also acted firmly to discourage sports links.

286. On no other issue in the Assembly is there such unanimity as exists on *apartheid.* Irrespective of ideological or political differences among us, we all condemn it unreservedly. Yet, after more than 30 years of this unequivocal condemnation, the policy of *apartheid* remains intact.

287. It is true that the system has changed in some respects, but the changes have not affected the central issue, the policy of separate development. Ireland believes that the international community has rightly judged the new constitution of South Africa to be a sham. We are convinced that it is no more than an attempt by South Africa to encourage the compliance of Coloured peoples and Indians with the exclusion of the black majority from the political process and thus to further entrench the *apartheid* system.

288. The constitutional innovation is an example of how South Africa has twisted and turned its policies over the years in an attempt to counter and appease the indignation of the world community. It is further evidence that South Africa has never favoured justice. It has only been buying time to adapt and ensure the survival of the old policies in new circumstances. Today, South Africa remains what it was: a society where human rights are systematically violated, where minority rule is ruthlessly imposed, where freedom of political expression is relentlessly stifled, where basic political rights are persistently denied, and where the dignity of man is affronted on a daily basis. But while all of this is thoroughly reprehensible and we condemn it, South Africa under *apartheid* is, to its shame, even more than this. It is the only society in the world today which openly, explicitly and as a matter of public policy has built its political system on race. It is a society where skin pigment alone determines destiny, and since a man cannot change the colour of his skin, *apartheid* offers the black man no hope.

289. Ireland believes that those who control the political activities of South Africa today may just still have it in their power to determine that change will come by peaceful means. If they have fears, those fears are the product of their own policies. The way to hope and confidence must be the path of peaceful change, for change is inevitable. Black South Africans cannot be asked or expected to endure forever a repression which stifles all aspects of their lives and condemns their children to the same hopeless destiny.

290. My Government believes that if change in South Africa is not to come through violence, we have a clear obligation to promote peaceful change there in such other ways as are open to us. However gloomy the outlook may seem, we believe that it is of the utmost importance for the whole international community to try to find ways to bring white South Africa to face reality and the dangers of its present course before it is too late.

291. Ireland has frequently indicated in the Assembly and elsewhere that it would favour the imposition of a series of graduated sanctions against South Africa. We think these sanctions would have to be imposed by the Security Council, which alone has the power to adopt mandatory sanctions on behalf of the international community. The sanctions should be carefully selected and, once adopted, they should be fully implemented by all. Specifically, we feel that the existing arms embargo should be strengthened and more carefully monitored; that a mandatory oil embargo should be formally imposed; and that loans to and new investments in South Africa should be banned. If properly handled and carefully directed, the international pressure we might bring to bear on South Africa can, we believe, be made effective.

292. Until such time as South Africa can be brought to change, however, my Government believes it of the utmost importance to promote humanitarian and legal assistance to those who suffer under South Africa's discriminatory legislation and to give assistance to their families and to refugees from South Africa.

293. In keeping with the views of my Government on *apartheid* which I have just expressed, the delegation of Ireland was pleased to co-sponsor two of the seven draft resolutions which were placed before us today, that is, A/39/L.33 and Add.1 on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and A/39/L.36 and Add.1 on concerted international action for the elimination of *apartheid.*

294. Ireland voted in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.29 and Add.1 on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid.* Of course, our attitude to the recommendations in the report of the Special Committee must be understood in accordance with the general policy of my Government on *apartheid* outlined in this and previous statements of our position.

295. Ireland also voted in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.31 and Add.1, which requests the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports to continue its work with a view to submitting the draft convention to the General Assembly at its fortieth session. We will, of course, examine the convention with interest. It is our hope that its terms will not give rise

to problems of a legal or constitutional nature for my Government.

296. Ireland supported draft resolution A/39/L.32 and Add.1 on public information and public action against *apartheid*. My Government believes it is extremely important that information on the abominable practices of *apartheid* should have the widest possible dissemination. We are also deeply concerned about the plight of political prisoners in South Africa, and we will continue to give our support to all appropriate efforts for their release.

297. I turn now to those resolutions which my delegation was unable to support. Ireland voted against draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1 on comprehensive sanctions against the *apartheid* régime and support to the liberation struggle in South Africa. We did so because there are many elements in the draft resolution which do not accord with the approach of my Government to the problem. My Government's commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations is well known. We also believe that the complete severance of all contacts with South Africa under a policy of total isolation, as called for by this draft resolution, would only have the effect of abandoning black South Africans still further to the whim of the South African authorities, who, without the reprobation of the international community, would then be even freer from restraints on their treatment of the black majority. Under a policy of total isolation, the outside world would have increased difficulty in continuing to monitor the situation of blacks. In such circumstances, Ireland would have the gravest fears for the welfare of black South Africans, especially in view of the tragic events which the world community has witnessed in South Africa in the past few weeks.

298. As I indicated earlier, Ireland supports the application by the Security Council of certain selective measures against South Africa; and we will be able to support many of the specific measures itemized in paragraph 11 of this draft resolution which are in accord with the policy of sanctions favoured by us. We have doubts, however, about the wisdom of calls for comprehensive sanctions at the present juncture. We believe that the right policy for the international community is one of steady and graduated pressure for change through carefully chosen, selective sanction measures which would be properly implemented by all.

299. We also cannot accept the explicit endorsement of the armed struggle in this resolution. We have made it clear in the past that we do not wish to see the Assembly endorse violence. Even if we can understand the sense of growing hopelessness and bitter frustration from which such violence might spring, my Government cannot condone it.

300. My delegation, as in previous years, voted against the draft resolution on relations between Israel and South Africa. In our view, this text singles out one Member State of the Assembly for selective condemnation in an inappropriate manner.

301. Mr. BAYONA MEDINA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru voted in favour of all of the draft resolutions on the question of *apartheid* in accordance with its position of firm rejection and condemnation of the system of *apartheid* and because it considers it necessary that the United Nations concentrate its efforts on achieving the definitive elimination of *apartheid*. However, it was not possible for my delegation to support the paragraphs of draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and Add.1 and L.30 and Add.1, which were put to a separate vote, because these contained selective references of condemnation of certain Member States.

302. We also wish to state that the delegation of Peru does not share the feeling that we should look for solutions to international problems by means of violence. We feel that this is not in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. For this reason, my delegation expresses its reservations with respect to those paragraphs of draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1 in which, directly or indirectly, encouragement is given to armed struggle.

303. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): My Government's commitment to the struggle for the eradication of *apartheid* is well known. There is no need for further elaboration. Besides measures the international community can and must take to eradicate the abhorrent system of *apartheid*, it is up to the people of South Africa to choose ways and means to do so. We would have wished to see that doors to peaceful change are not closed. Each country or group of countries will choose the best ways to support that struggle.

304. We, for our part, reaffirm our political, moral and diplomatic support to the ANC in its struggle for the total eradication of *apartheid* and for the establishment of a non-racial and democratic society based on majority rule.

305. My delegation would like to reiterate the fact that the People's Republic of Mozambique is not in a position to apply economic sanctions against South Africa. Our voting pattern was dictated solely by our deeply-felt abhorrence to and repudiation of the policies of *apartheid* and everything stemming from them. It in no way signifies that we are in agreement with every word, wording or phrases in the resolutions. Our action is dictated by the sight of school children being crushed by military tanks, by the agonizing cries of helpless prisoners being tortured and by the brutal herding of 24 million people into concentration camps. *Apartheid* is not just evil; it is evil itself. These are the only reasons—there are no others—that dictate our voting pattern.

306. Mr. AOKI (Japan): Japan is firmly and steadfastly opposed to the practice of *apartheid* and extends maximum co-operation to United Nations efforts for the elimination of *apartheid*. Accordingly, my delegation has consistently tried to take a positive stance on the various draft resolutions proposed on this item, and it is in this spirit that we supported five draft resolutions, namely, A/39/L.29 and Add.1, L.31 and Add.1, L.32 and Add.1, L.33 and Add.1 and L.36 and Add.1. Indeed, we co-sponsored draft resolution A/39/L.33 and Add.1 on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, whose efforts we value highly. Unfortunately, however, my delegation could not support the two remaining resolutions because we consider them to be excessively confrontational and unproductive.

307. My delegation voted against draft resolution A/39/L.28 and Add.1 because it contains many elements, such as those in paragraphs 10, 14, 15, 19 to 22 and 29 to 31, which my Government cannot support. My delegation cannot support other elements in the resolution as well, such as the singling out of a particular country for blame. In this connection, we join many other speakers in deploring

what has happened this morning. We firmly believe that the manoeuvre and subsequent confusion we just witnessed will not serve to advance our cause in the fight against *apartheid* and risk being detrimental to the credibility of the Organization. We hope that this will not recur. Neither can we support the call for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. My country does not believe that comprehensive sanctions would in fact be an effective and expeditious means for achieving a peaceful solution to the question of *apartheid*.

308. Let me next turn to draft resolution A/39/L.36 and Add.1. My delegation supported this resolution because it is in line with Japan's basic position of applying maximum pressure, through peaceful means, to induce South Africa to abandon its *apartheid* policy and of giving moral and humanitarian support to those who struggle for the eradication of *apartheid*. My delegation wishes, in particular, to commend the authors of this resolution for their efforts to avoid introducing unnecessary and controversial elements so as to gain as wide support as possible. We welcome this new attempt and hope that this approach will continue in the years to come.

309. However, my delegation has reservations on some of the various concrete measures proposed in the resolution. For example, paragraph 5 goes beyond the allocation of responsibilities provided for in the Charter. Furthermore, paragraph 7 contains an element whose implementation my country cannot ensure. With reference to sub-paragraph 8 (*b*), my delegation would like to reiterate its conviction that the solution of the problem of *apartheid* should be sought in a peaceful manner through dialogue between the parties concerned.

310. Finally, I should like to refer briefly to draft resolution A/39/L.29 and Add.1, which has just been adopted. In paragraph 3 of this resolution, the Assembly endorses the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*A/39/22*]. Although my delegation has voted in favour of the resolution, we cannot accept some of the conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraphs 284 through 418 of the report. My delegation is also concerned about paragraphs 4 and 5, which give the Special Committee against *Apartheid* an excessively wide margin of discretion. We earnestly hope that the Special Committee will manage its budget efficiently. In particular, we hope that the Special Committee will report back to the General Assembly on how it spent the $400,000 allocated to it under paragraph 5.

311. Mr. AYE (Burma): In keeping with Burma's firm stand against the policies of *apartheid*, my delegation has just cast positive votes on all the draft resolutions before us on this question. However, we regret to note that some paragraphs in draft resolutions A/39/L.28 and Add.1 and A/39/L.30 and Add.1 have selectively singled out specific countries for condemnation. Accordingly, my delegation would like to express its reservations as to the language in this respect. With regard to the vote taken earlier today on this subject of whether the question of *apartheid* requires a two-thirds majority, my delegation would like to clarify that our abstention in the vote on this subject does not in any way detract from our consistent and continuing stand against the policies of *apartheid*. But my delegation is of the view that the vote taken this morning on the motion was influenced by motivations that are extraneous to the anti-*apartheid* struggle.

312. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): Let me begin by expressing our appreciation to all those Member States who supported the elimination of hostile references to the United States from these resolutions. The United States has repeatedly made clear its abhorrence for the system of *apartheid*, whose racist premises and practices we condemn. In the light of the principles of equal rights and equal justice, which are the foundation of our way of life, there can be no justification for a political system that deprives the majority of South Africa's citizens of their political and civil rights.

313. In his proclamation on Human Rights Day this week, President Reagan made clear the strong desire of the American people to see an end to the manifest injustices of the *apartheid* system of racial discrimination in South Africa. The abusive practices arising from that system have once again led to violence in South Africa which has claimed the lives of scores of its black citizens. Clearly, all members of this body, and in particular the United States, passionately demand urgent steps to bring the *apartheid* system to an end and to relieve all South Africans of the burdens of this tragedy. Should we encourage an approach that exacerbates the potential for violence and destruction? Should we follow a course of destructive disengagement that will isolate black South Africans from the concrete support and aid of other members of the international community? Or should we seek to build a future even as we destroy *apartheid*, by making effective use of the levers of change that offer black South Africans the economic, technical and organizational base they need in order to pursue their struggle for justice.

314. The United States believes that only the latter course effectively fights against present injustice without sacrificing future hopes and possibilities. We believe that many aspects of the resolutions before us would undermine the basis for building that future and deprive black South Africans of the powerful tools for change present in the South African economy. We are opposed to destroying those tools through a policy of economic sanctions that would deprive black South Africans of the wages, skills and organizational base they need in their quest for justice. We believe that effective means must be employed to assure that those tools will be available and will be used to oppose the *apartheid* system and the abusive practices that flow from it. Because of these beliefs, we have voted against those resolutions which are inconsistent with them.

315. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania has asked to make a statement in reply. I call on the representative in accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 3rd meeting of the present session.

316. Mr. MAKHANDA (Pan Africanist Congress of Azania): On behalf of the dispossessed, oppressed, exploited and discriminated against struggling masses of Azania and on behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, the custodian of their genuine aspirations, allow me, Sir, in this our humble intervention to make a few observations on the statement made this morning by the representative of the United States.

317. The representative of the United States appealed to the sense of justice and fairness of the General Assembly in considering its amendments which would delete certain references to the United

States in the resolutions dealing with my country. Had I been the representative of the United States, I would have couched the appeal differently. I would certainly not have used the words "justice" and "fairness" in this international forum, for to do so would be further to expose that country's double standard approach to international issues, especially the issues of *apartheid.*

318. As the guardian of international peace and security, in what area has the United States Administration shown fairness and justice? Massacres have been perpetrated against human lives in the Middle East, in southern Africa and in Latin America, areas where the United States of America could have made a difference if it believed in justice and fairness. In Azania, hundreds of schoolchildren were massacred in 1976 in what has come to be known as the Soweto uprising. On which side was the United States—that of justice and fairness, or big business interests? Since September this year, our people have been burying their dead, killed by the racist régime, and have been arrested. Just today this was mentioned by the Chairman of the Special Committee of the members of the United Democratic Front and also members of the National Forum Committee. Others have been detained, others have been tortured, and still others are languishing in the dungeons of Robben Island. One of our leaders, Zephania Mothopeng, who has been to Robben Island three times, will have a total of over 40 years in gaol if he lives. Six teenagers, schoolchildren of the PAC were sentenced to natural life imprisonment in 1963 for upholding the principles on which the United States of America is founded and is no longer practising. Is the present Administration invoking these principles of justice and fairness in its policy of constructive engagement towards Azania to stop the above? Indeed, one may ask the representative of the United States: is there a principle of justice and fairness in the representation of the blacks and other minorities? I use the term "blacks" very guardedly, since in the language of the PAC we do not recognize the compartmentalization of peoples, but believe in one human race. However, since it is within the framework of the system here, I will use it. I ask: is there any fairness and justice, for instance, in the representation of the blacks in this country? Statistics just released have shown that the people of African descent in the United States are disproportionately represented, and one would be hard pressed to define the system under which they live as a democratic one. If justice and fairness were a concept not dependent on God, we in Azania would have long since given up our struggle. We are struggling, and will continue to do so, because it is His justice and fairness we are struggling for in Azania and not that defined by the representative of the United States and others.

319. On a different level, one would have expected the representative of the United States to understand what it means to be denationalized, to be insecure from the cradle to the grave, to be persecuted and tagged and branded like an animal because of the pass laws, coming as he does from a people that has had to endure all of these dehumanizing acts.

Mr. Farah Dirir (Djibouti), Vice-President, took the Chair.

320. Last but not least, may I take this opportunity, Mr. President, through you to reply to the assertion of the representative of Australia that the national liberation movements of Azania do not represent the people under *apartheid.* I would say only that his negation of the intelligence of the oppressed and dispossessed masses of Azania is to be regretted and that the statement he has made on this issue is unfortunate indeed. My people is a democratic people, my people subscribes to the ideals of the Pan Africanist Congress, my people subscribes to the ideas of the African National Congress and other groups such as the National Forum Committee, of which Bishop Tutu is a member, and the United Democratic Front.

AGENDA ITEM 34

Law of the Sea: Report of the Secretary-General

321. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, who will introduce draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1 entitled "Law of the Sea".

322. Mr. HYERA (United Republic of Tanzania): The Assembly has before it draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1, sponsored by 35 States. On behalf of the delegations of sponsoring States, I have the honour, for which I am grateful, to introduce the draft resolution. As usual, it is the product of exhaustive consultations among interested delegations. It is, of necessity, a compromise draft, which represents no more than a common denominator of many differing interests and does not, therefore, purport to meet all expectations. I wish, first, to thank all those delegations that took part in the negotiations on the draft resolution for their co-operation and spirit of accommodation.

323. This is the second year the General Assembly has had to address such a resolution, following the adoption at Montego Bay of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The subject is, therefore, not new. Nor, in fact, are most of the contents of the draft resolution.

324. Paragraph 1 once more recalls the historic significance of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as an important contribution to the maintenance of peace, justice and progress for all peoples of the world.

325. Paragraph 2 expresses the satisfaction of the General Assembly at the very large number of signatures affixed to the Convention—something on which I shall have something to say shortly—as well as the number of ratifications deposited with the Secretary-General.

326. Now that the period when the Convention was opened for signature has expired, an appeal is being made to all States to ratify or accede to the Convention at the earliest possible date so as to enable the Convention to enter into force as soon as possible. This appeal is reflected in paragraph 3, which calls upon all States that have not yet done so to consider ratifying or acceding to the Convention at the earliest possible date so as to allow the effective entry into force of the new legal régime for the uses of the sea and its resources.

327. Paragraph 4 calls upon all States to safeguard the unified character of the Convention and related resolutions adopted therewith.

328. Paragraph 5 calls upon States to desist from taking actions which undermine the Convention or defeat its object and purpose. This paragraph refers

to any actions that may have been carried out, or might be contemplated for the future, aimed at adversely affecting the Convention or defeating its object and purpose.

329. Paragraph 6 expresses the appreciation of the General Assembly for the effective execution by the Secretary-General of the major programme in law of the sea affairs under chapter 25 of the activities of the medium-term plan. Chapter 25 is a new chapter that has recently been incorporated in the medium-term plan of the United Nations for 1984-1989, and it is encouraging to note that the activities outlined therein have begun to be implemented effectively and efficiently. The Secretary-General, through his Special Representative, Mr. Satya Nandan, and his team, has done a commendable job on matters concerning the law of the sea, and deserves our appreciation and encouragement.

330. Paragraph 7 further expresses the Assembly's appreciation for the report of the Secretary-General in respect to General Assembly resolution 38/59 A and requests the Secretary-General to continue the activities outlined therein, special emphasis being placed on the work of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, including the implementation of resolution II of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Resolution II deals with the protection of preparatory investments in pioneer activities related to polymetallic nodules.

331. Through paragraph 8, the General Assembly will approve the programme of meetings of the Preparatory Commission for 1985. During 1985 the Preparatory Commission is scheduled to hold its regular session at Kingston from 11 March to 4 April and to hold a summer meeting at Geneva or Kingston or in New York. The venue of this meeting will be decided upon by the Preparatory Commission during its spring session.

332. Paragraph 9 calls upon the Secretary-General to continue to assist States in the implementation of the Convention and in the development of a consistent and uniform approach to the new legal régime thereunder, as well as in their national, subregional and regional efforts towards the full realization of the benefits therefrom, and invites the agencies and bodies within the United Nations system to co-operate and lend assistance in these endeavours. This is an important responsibility of the Secretary-General, and becomes particularly significant as States proceed to implement the Convention, especially in relation to areas under national jurisdiction. It is important that the Secretary-General should provide advice and assistance to States in order that State practice develop in a coherent and uniform manner consistent with the Convention. It is equally important that States be enabled to derive maximum benefit from the Convention and incorporate development of marine resources within their overall national development programmes.

333. In paragraph 10, the General Assembly requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session on developments relating to the Convention and on the implementation of the present resolution; and in paragraph 11, the last one, the General Assembly decides to include this item on the agenda of its fortieth session.

334. Having highlighted the salient features of the draft resolution, I should like briefly to refer to the subject of the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea, launched in 1980 in honour of the late Shirley Amerasinghe, a former President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. As will be noted in the Secretary-General's report, as a result of the generous contribution of States, institutions and individuals, the target figure has now been reached to enable the award of at least one fellowship each year from the fund's income. I wish to commend and thank all those who have made these contributions and to appeal to others to do likewise—not only in honour of that distinguished man, but also to advance the cause to which he devoted much of his life, for which we are all deeply indebted to him.

335. May I also at this point request the Assembly to remember one of the most outstanding persons who made a special contribution to the codification and development of the law of the sea, a man who, unfortunately, passed away this year—Mr. Constantin A. Stavropoulos, who was former Legal Counsel of the United Nations and the first Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea before being succeeded by Mr. Bernardo Zuleta, who, unfortunately, passed away last year.

336. The services of this eminent lawyer, Constantin Stavropoulos, to the Organization, and to the Law of the Sea in particular, go back to the very early days of the United Nations. He was a key participant in the 1958 and 1960 Conferences on the Law of the Sea, and since the United Nations decided to deal with issues of the sea-bed and to convene the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, he had been leading the United Nations team that helped organize and service those meetings until his country, Greece, decided after the Caracas session to charge him with responsibilities in his Government. His international stature makes it unnecessary for me to attempt to relate his well-known contributions to the United Nations. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea will remain a lasting monument to all its eminent architects, and Mr. Constantin Stavropoulos is certainly one of them.

337. I believe I am voicing the sentiments of all friends in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea by stating that we have lost one of the great men in the Organization. I request the delegation of Greece to transmit to the family of Mr. Stavropoulos and to the Government of Greece our expression of deep sorrow and sympathy.

338. The subject before the Assembly is of such momentous—indeed, critical—importance to humanity that I feel that we can never too often remind ourselves of what the Convention on the Law of the Sea offers and what it means to mankind.

339. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, worked out and adopted with the commitment and full sponsorship of the General Assembly, pursuant to its responsibility set out in the Charter, has been rightly described as the second most historic institution for international peace and co-operation after the Charter of the United Nations. For, dealing with the uses of more than two thirds of our planet's total area, it addresses important issues and pursues our own commitments under the Charter.

340. Let me quickly draw the attention of the Assembly to some of the commitments and promises

we have made through our acceptance of the Charter. I will merely paraphrase what we said. We have committed ourselves to maintain international peace and security—of course—and to that end *inter alia* to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace (Article 1, para. 1); to reaffirm faith in, among other things, the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small (second preambular paragraph); to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character (Article 1, para. 3); to harmonize through the United Nations the actions of Member States in the attainment of the purposes of the United Nations (Article 1, para. 4); and to employ international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancement of all peoples (last preambular paragraph).

341. The Convention seeks to achieve all those purposes. It creates and develops international law where it was admittedly lacking or was in a state of confusion; it lays a sound foundation for harmonious uses of the oceans and for effective co-operation over the uses of a vast international area; it establishes conditions for justice and prosperity for all; and it establishes machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, actual and potential. In so doing, it offers a singular opportunity to prevent an otherwise very likely eruption of world conflicts, the dimensions and consequences of which cannot but be unfortunate.

342. It should be stressed that the Convention is not only a product of exhaustive negotiations and a practical attempt to balance differing interests, but a fairly generous concession to the more economically developed States.

343. Having myself been personally involved in the negotiations throughout the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, I am convinced that there is no alternative to the present text of the Convention and that there can be no alibi for not becoming party to it, nor any for not respecting the package we all worked hard to achieve.

344. In conclusion, I wish, on behalf of the sponsors—and I believe I am also voicing the sentiments of most delegations—to join the Secretary-General in expressing great satisfaction at the unprecedented support for the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, as signified by the 159 signatures to it by 9 December. We believe that, as the Secretary-General observed on 10 December, the Convention has indeed irreversibly transformed the political map of the world and that future developments in the law of the sea will doubtless revolve around the Convention.

345. I hope the draft resolution will receive the Assembly's overwhelming, if not unanimous, support.

346. Mr. MAQUEIRA (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of 77 of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority, which meets at the headquarters of that Authority at Kingston, it is my honour to address the Assembly in connection with agenda item 34, entitled "Law of the sea".

347. We have taken note with interest of the report submitted by the Secretary-General (A/39/647 and Corr.1 and Add.1) in connection with activities relating to the law of the sea and issues developed by the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea as well as other departments of the Secretariat and agencies of the United Nations in this sphere.

348. We are pleased to note the efforts aimed at ensuring universal acceptance of the Convention and its uniform and co-ordinated implementation. We are confident that the Secretariat will continue to fulfil its role of providing assistance and information in all the areas covered by the Convention, as it has done thus far.

349. On 9 December last the deadline for becoming a signatory of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea was met, and the 159 States that signed it demonstrate the solid and permanent commitment of the international community to that international instrument.

350. The normal process of distinguishing in treaties and conventions between signatory States and ratifying States and adherents has special significance in the case of this Convention.

351. That is true because of the fact that a number of countries of great technological and industrial might, in the course of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, as a means of facilitating acceptance of the Convention, asked for an interim system to be established which would make it possible for them to conduct activities on the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction until the entry into force of the Convention.

352. The developing countries, demonstrating a spirit of pragmatism and flexibility, agreed to negotiate a system of that type since signature of the Convention was the enabling condition for benefiting from the Convention. Thus resolution II, adopted by that Conference, contains the investment system to which the industrialized countries aspired.

353. The hopes of the Group of 77 to contribute, through its concessions in this way, to the universalization of the Convention turned to disappointment and regret, since only some of the countries that would benefit from this interim system, showing good faith and vision for the future, joined the international community by signing the Convention and today stand side by side with the developing countries in getting under way this complex mechanism within the Preparatory Commission.

354. None the less, the three most industrialized countries, those that insisted the most on the interim system, are not signatories to the Convention.

355. More serious still is their insistence on arriving at an alternative system on the basis of national legislation and agreements of restricted participation of States outside the Convention, to exploit the resources of the sea-bed on the basis of anachronistic and selfish principles which they themselves had recently abandoned. Thus the Declaration of Principles Governing the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor, and the Subsoil Thereof, beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction [*resolution 2749(XXV)*] came about, and was adopted by consensus, which provides that the sea-bed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction is the common heritage of mankind. The concrete expression of this resolution is part XI of the Convention. Those same countries now want to disregard and, what is more serious, to deny those principles, using legal arguments that only serve to conceal a regrettable lack of political will.

356. It is becoming customary, although none the less unacceptable, for some industrialized countries to require concessions from the developing countries in order to reach a consensus and then, once they are obtained, to disregard the political compromise on which they were based, doing harm to the multilateral negotiating process that is essential to the progressive development of international law and to the promotion of international co-operation and peace.

357. A recent example of this, in addition to the one I have mentioned, is that of a Western European country which sought and obtained in the Preparatory Commission this year a settlement of a specific situation affecting it, with the argument that that would facilitate the signature of the law of the sea Convention—something that could have been done without that special treatment.

358. Once again the Group of 77 agreed. Then on 9 December it happened that that country, designated to be the seat of one of the organs established by the Convention, refrained from signing it, although it continues to be a party to alternative systems that are contrary to the Convention. It is not possible to claim to be host to an organ established by the Convention and at the same time to conduct activities contrary to it. To obtain the headquarters of a permanent organ is, after all, an honour and recognition of the country which obtains it. Only a concrete, resolute commitment to the international agreement can be consistent with that honour, and it is regrettable that in the case of that State it is clear that such a commitment is not present.

359. Nor is it possible to aspire to a selective, piecemeal approach to the Convention. Those who are not prepared to assume the obligations of the Convention cannot aspire to benefit from its provisions. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is a legal and political entity.

360. Once again I must reiterate the position of the Group of 77, to the effect that the Convention contains the sole international legally acceptable régime for activities on the sea-bed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and that the Group rejects any agreement based on national legislation which claims to regulate those activities. The Group of 77 emphatically affirms that such agreements are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Convention and that they generate no rights whatsoever.

361. The Group of 77 here reaffirms its commitment to supporting the Convention, because that international instrument, in addition to codifying and developing the norms applicable to the sea, ensures an excellent balance between the different uses of the oceans and between the individual interests of each State and those of the international community at large.

362. The role of the United Nations is that of a builder of peace, a lasting unambiguous peace, where rights and obligations are shared equitably so that no one feels it is contributing more than it receives. There is near here a plaque which says "Respect for the rights of others is peace".

363. The Convention has achieved respect for the rights of others, and it is for that reason perhaps the most significant contribution of the United Nations to the essential objectives of the Charter.

364. That is why the Group of 77 will always be prepared to try to resolve difficulties in order to make it possible for there to be an effective implementation of the norms of the new legal order governing the oceans. Demonstration of this is the pragmatic way in which we have approached the substantive work of the Preparatory Commission, working on the basis of consensus and with experience prevailing over ideology.

365. It is very possible that, thanks to this approach, at the coming session of the Preparatory Commission which will be held from 11 March to 4 April next year, the registry of operators in the international zone will begin, and that will demonstrate that rules of access to the sea-bed as established in the Convention and in resolution II are not mere theories and that they will become concrete reality.

366. This week was the deadline for signing the Convention. This reminds me of an old Brazilian song that says: "When one dreams alone, dreams remain just that—dreams; but when we dream together, then reality begins."

367. That there are 159 signatories of the Convention means that that reality has begun and that there is no viable alternative to this Convention.

368. On behalf of the Group of 77, I invite all the countries that have not yet done so to adhere to that instrument and to join the generous and noble cause of establishing peace and order in the oceans.

369. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet Union, like the other socialist countries, consistently supports the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and firmly advocates unswerving and strict implementation thereof by all States of the world, and the bringing into effect of a comprehensive legal order for peace and co-operation in the world's oceans, as established by the Convention. As was correctly noted by the Secretary-General in a recent statement, the fact that the Convention has been signed by 159 States and relevant parties clearly shows the unprecedented nature of a universal document of such a comprehensive nature as this. We should like to express our special gratitude for the Secretary-General's efforts in support of this important international Convention which ensures a harmonized, legal régime—harmonized among States—for two thirds of our earth's surface.

370. The Soviet Union was one of the first countries to sign the Convention, and we attach particular importance to the fact that it has been signed by almost all the States of the five continents of the world, with only one exception. This shows essentially the total isolation and condemnation by the world community of those forces trying, for their own selfish, narrow interests, to boycott the Convention so as to undermine it through one-sided arbitrary actions and thus to undermine a harmonized convention for a régime of the world's oceans.

371. The international importance of the Convention is becoming clearer and more universally recognized every day. It is the outcome of lengthy negotiations and compromise agreements, taking into account the interests of all groups of States and peoples. The Convention resolves in one single unified act, as it were, the most acute and complex questions of a legal régime for the seas and oceans today. It defines the rights and obligations of all States and creates a single streamlined system for international regulation, under international law, of all the main types and forms of utilization of the resources and space of the world's oceans.

372. The Convention serves as an example for resolving important, complex global problems in the United Nations, that is, through negotiations. It is an important contribution to the strengthening of peace, security and co-operation of States as regards the seas. Without any doubt, it is an important achievement of recent decades, implementation of which is in accordance with the aspirations of all peoples and will promote the conversion of the world's oceans into a zone of peace and co-operation in the interests of present and future generations.

373. The main obstacle to bringing into force the harmonized provisions of the Convention remains the United States policy of one-sided division and annexation of the resources of the international sea-bed region, which the Convention declares to be the common heritage of mankind. At the same time, the United States and some of its Western allies, while refusing to sign the Convention and carrying out unilateral actions circumventing its provisions, are trying to derive separate advantages from its provisions in the economic zone, on the continental shelf and elsewhere.

374. However, such a selective, arbitrary approach is contradictory, because the Convention is one indivisible whole, a body of compromise agreements among all States, which does not permit the use or enjoyment of some benefits to the detriment of all other requirements covered by the Convention. Apart from the Convention and the specific régime for the sea-bed that it establishes, unilateral actions to establish economic zones and to arrogate the world's oceans and their resources are not legitimate.

375. The policy of one-sided actions and claims which circumvent the Convention serves today as a manifestation of an imperialist policy to divide and annex those spaces and resources. This is irresponsible and adventuristic in nature and is reflected in the fact that it undermines the very bases for the utilization of the world's oceans for communications, trade and co-operation; it harms the interests of all countries, including those carrying out this policy.

376. We cannot be quiet either about recent attempts by some States to hammer together a mini-treaty to be applied in a way parallel to the Convention's régime. Recently, in Geneva, the United States and seven Western countries signed a so-called temporary agreement on questions relating to the deep-water areas of the sea-bed. That was an attempt to legalize the aspirations of a number of monopolies to annex and divide the most promising sectors of the international sea-bed, in circumvention and violation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. This action is aimed, to the detriment of the Convention and the legitimate interests of other States, at ensuring uncontrolled activities in the exploration and exploitation of sea-bed resources. It is a separate action in contradiction with the letter and the spirit of the Convention. It has been condemned by the overwhelming majority of States Parties and the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority.

377. We regret that among the participants in the separate agreement there are some States which have signed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. As we know, the generally recognized norms of international law obligate States which sign an international treaty to refrain from any actions aimed at undermining that treaty. Naturally, that applies fully to the Convention itself, which is universal in nature.

378. The activities of the Preparatory Commission of the International Sea-Bed Authority have been very important in strengthening the régime of the Convention. We note with pleasure the progress it achieved at its last sessions. Despite the opposition of some circles which have tried to drag out and make its work difficult, the Commission has succeeded in working out, and adopting provisionally, a significant part of the rules for the registration of pioneer investors for activities connected with polymetallic nodules, and steps have been taken to create detailed norms for the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the international sea-bed area.

379. It is important that the Commission should, without any delay, carry out the elaboration of the rules of registration for those pioneer investors and move on to their registration, as flows from the Convention and the appropriate decisions of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. A great deal depends on successful progress in the Preparatory Commission's work in reaching mutually acceptable solutions in this area with respect to the establishment of the International Sea-Bed Authority, as well as speeding the process of ratification of the Convention by States and its entry into force.

380. The report prepared by the Secretariat reflects the strengthening of support for the Convention from the various groups of States and its growing effect on their policies in various maritime areas. In particular, attention is very rightly given here to questions relating to the implementation of the provisions of the Convention in national legislation and the practical activities of various States. Of great importance, too, is the continuing intensification of United Nations activities and those of other relevant international bodies, aimed at supporting the Convention and practically implementing its provisions.

381. A certain defect of the report is to be found in the fact that it does not draw a clear distinction between States that signed the Convention and are implementing it and those that are violating it and trying to undermine it by illegal, one-sided actions. Thus, it is very wrong to equate legislation concerning the Convention and unilateral acts designed to violate it. The ongoing implementation of the decisions of the United Nations in support of the Convention requires that the Secretariat correct this mistake.

382. On the basis of these decisions and in the requirements of objectivity we must not allow the actions of those who are opposing and violating the Convention to be covered up. The draft resolution now before the Assembly reflects the results of consultations among various States, in accordance with the goals and principles of the Convention. It is aimed against any unilateral one-sided action. It reflects the demand that all refrain from one-sided actions and strictly comply with the unified single Convention in its basic provisions. The draft is aimed at further intensifying the activities of the Preparatory Commission to establish the International Sea-Bed Authority and at strengthening the activities of the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies in support of the Convention.

383. In supporting the adoption of this resolution, the Soviet delegation stresses the urgent need, with-

out delay, to end any and all one-sided actions aimed at undermining the Convention.

384. We salute Cuba and all those countries which have already ratified the Convention. We call upon all States to follow this example. Ratification of the Convention and its entry into force will strengthen a régime of peace and co-operation on the seas and open up new paths for utilizing the sea and its resources in the interests of this and future generations.

385. Mr. KIRSCH (Canada): Canada continues to attach great importance to the goal of achieving a universally acceptable régime for the management of the world's oceans and their resources. For this reason we welcome the fact that a number of States have signed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the past few weeks, thus bringing the total number of signatories to the Convention to 159. As we can see, this represents a near consensus within the international community with respect to the legal basis for regulation of and co-operation in ocean affairs. The Convention, in our view, remains the only means by which to bring certainty into the international law of the sea. Despite this conclusion, unfortunately, the uncertainty that the Convention was intended to clear up still persists to some extent. Some States, including major industrialized States, have not signed the Convention. We regret this fact, but continue to hope that these States will maintain their interest in the Convention and at some stage will reconsider their position.

386. The reconsideration that I have just referred to depends, we believe, to a great extent on the outcome of the work of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. It is our hope, and this is the goal toward which the Canadian delegation is working, that the Preparatory Commission will succeed in formulating rules and regulations for sea-bed mining and the operation of the Enterprise that will be practical, workable and economical. We would like to see a sea-bed-mining system that works and not one that discourages potential sea-bed miners from participating in the process. It should be a system that is seen to operate in the interests and for the benefit of all States. If the sea-bed-mining system is to be truly effective and bring about the financial and technological benefits envisaged in the Convention, the major sea-bed miners must be a part of it. We hope that this participation will be one of the consequences of the work of the Preparatory Commission.

387. My delegation believes that the Preparatory Commission has made a good beginning in the pursuit of the objective of achieving an effective sea-bed mining régime. Of course, we must recall that it is only at the very preliminary stages of its deliberations, and it cannot be said to have proceeded much beyond the stage of identifying issues. My delegation believes that such a thorough, measured and prudent approach is most appropriate for dealing with the difficult and technically complex questions before the Preparatory Commission. It is generally accepted that, as a practical matter, sea-bed mining is a long way down the road. Therefore, there is no need to arrive at hasty conclusions. We do have sufficient time to make a careful analysis of issues and balancing of interests. We should thus in the process be able to develop a balanced and practical system which meets the concerns of all States.

388. The same holds true to a great extent with respect to the work that is being carried out in the Preparatory Commission on the pioneer investment régime. Again, we believe that the approach to the development of rules and regulations on the registration of the claims of pioneer investors should be careful and deliberate. In fact, the most difficult and pressing issue with respect to pioneer investment is something that is not even being discussed in the meetings of the Preparatory Commission itself, namely, the resolution of overlaps of mine-site claims. Once that problem is resolved, the other issues should be easier to address. The Preparatory Commission must make every effort to retain the main elements of resolution II. This includes acknowledging and respecting all sea-bed mining interests which have been identified in the resolution. Circumstances have changed drastically since the time resolution II was negotiated. Some of its provisions have been overtaken by events. The timetable and arbitration clauses, for example, have not been observed by anyone. Nevertheless, we must be realistic and acknowledge the most important consideration to achieve the purpose and object of the resolution, namely, the development of an effective sea-bed mining system that allows for the participation of all potential sea-bed miners.

389. I referred a moment ago to the fact that some of the important developments that took place at the 1984 session of the Preparatory Commission were the result of extensive informal consultations among the States concerned and were the object of little or no discussion at the meetings of the Preparatory Commission.

390. This is the case, in particular, of an understanding that was reached at the Geneva meeting among the States that had announced their intention to submit applications for their registration as pioneer investors. That understanding, which is called the "Understanding on Resolution of Conflicts among Applicants for Registration as Pioneer Investors", relates to the procedure and a timetable for resolution of any conflicts that might arise from overlapping of areas claimed by these applicants. On 31 August 1984, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission made a statement in which he reported that "an understanding has been achieved amongst the parties concerned", the parties concerned being, to our knowledge, France, India, Japan and the Soviet Union. That statement and the understanding itself are contained in document LOS/PCN/L.8. Exactly the same statement was repeated by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission on 4 September and is contained in paragraph 8 of document LOS/PCN/L.13.

391. Despite the statements made by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, it appears that some confusion has arisen with respect to the nature and scope of that understanding. We wish to refer in this regard to the report of the Secretary-General on the law of the sea [*A/39/647 and Corr.1 and Add.1*]. That document is a very informative and well-prepared paper, which should be of assistance to States in a number of areas. It contains in particular, in its paragraphs 80 to 93, a description of the work accomplished by the Preparatory Commission during 1984. In general, that description is a good and accurate summary; but, perhaps as a result of an obvious and commendable concern for brevity, the

document contains two statements that, in our view, deserve further clarification.

392. Paragraph 86 of the report states the following: "At the end of the Geneva meeting the Chairman announced that an understanding had been reached on the procedure and on a timetable for conflict resolution for the first group of applicants." Paragraph 83 states, *inter alia*, the following:

> "The Commission has decided that, following the adoption of the rules for the registration of pioneer investors, it will proceed to register the first group of applicants at the third session of the Preparatory Commission, to be held in Kingston from 11 March to 5 April 1985. In the mean time the Commission has requested the first group of applicants to resolve as soon as possible conflicts with respect to the overlapping of the areas claimed."

393. Paragraph 86 of the report is ambiguous in that it fails to specify, as had been done twice by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, that this understanding was not reached by the Preparatory Commission but by the parties concerned, that is, once again to our knowledge, France, India, Japan and the Soviet Union.

394. As to paragraph 83, it simply is not accurate, because it is based on language used in the understanding in question that has not been endorsed, directly or indirectly, by the Preparatory Commission and has not been the object of any decision by the Preparatory Commission.

395. The very notion of a first group of applicants has not been used by the Preparatory Commission or by its Chairman, except with reference to the terms of the understanding that was reached by the four States concerned. The only decision that the Preparatory Commission itself took with respect to registration of pioneer investors is contained in paragraph 14 of document LOS/PCN/L.13, and it is to "complete the consideration of the draft rules on pioneer investors and adopt them". That is the only decision that was taken by the Preparatory Commission in that regard. Both part I and part II of the understanding that I mentioned earlier, therefore, reflect the views of the parties to that understanding only and as such have no effect on other States.

396. We are aware, of course, that the report of the Secretary-General was prepared for information purposes only and, as I indicated earlier, it is a very helpful document. It is clear also that the only authoritative statements on the work of the Preparatory Commission are those contained in the documents produced at its meetings. Nevertheless, given the misperceptions that may have developed with respect to the stage reached by the Preparatory Commission in its consideration of the registration of pioneer investors, we thought it might be helpful to clarify the matter at this stage.

397. Although we need not proceed from a sense of urgency, there is still a great deal of ground to be covered and much work to do in the context of the Preparatory Commission. We must address the issues adequately and comprehensively. For its part, Canada will spare no effort in contributing to a successful outcome of its work. To a very great extent, the future of the Convention depends on the success achieved by the Preparatory Commission.

398. Mr. SWINNEN (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I wish first of all to reply to the criticisms levelled at the provisional arrangement of 3 August 1984. My delegation reaffirms that that agreement is in complete conformity with one of the fundamental principles of international law—that is, the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is in no way designed to substitute another régime for the one provided for in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

399. The General Assembly has before it the report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/647 and Corr.1 and Add.1*]. That document is extremely useful and enlightening in many respects, and my delegation expresses its appreciation to the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea.

400. My delegation has examined with particular interest the chapter concerning the proceedings and results of the second session of the Preparatory Commission of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, which took place at Kingston from 19 March to 13 April 1984. Belgium carefully followed the work of that session as an observer and, beginning with the next session of the Preparatory Commission, will attend as a full-fledged member, since it has just signed the Convention.

401. As was indicated in the statement made at the time of signature, Belgium whole-heartedly hopes that the Preparatory Commission will succeed in correcting the insufficiencies and imperfections still contained in certain provisions of part XI and annexes 3 and 4 of the Convention. We have expressed the hope that, to that end, the Preparatory Commission will prepare rules, regulations and procedures for the purpose of, on the one hand, facilitating the acceptance of the new régime by the international community as a whole and, on the other, making possible the real exploitation of the common heritage of mankind for the benefit of all—and especially the least developed countries. It is in that same constructive spirit that the Belgian delegation will continue to participate in the meetings of the Preparatory Commission.

402. Guided by the same desire to contribute constructively to the progress of the work of the Preparatory Commission, my delegation associates itself with what was just said by the representative of Canada in regard to paragraphs 83 and 86 of the Secretary-General's report. In fact, those paragraphs contain language which lends itself to some ambiguity and which my delegation, regretfully, cannot support. The agreement on the settlement of disputes concluded between France, India, Japan and the Soviet Union did not culminate in a decision by the Preparatory Commission. But we get a different impression from paragraphs 83 and 86 of the report. Mr. Warioba, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, confined himself to reading out the agreement, and the Commission was not called upon to take a stand on it. Hence, Belgium could not be considered to be a party to that agreement. My Government feels that the question of the settlement of disputes can be solved satisfactorily only by agreements that include all the parties that could be affected by overlappings or encroachments at a given site.

403. Finally, I would repeat my Government's hope that, generally speaking, and in accordance with the principle of financial responsibility, sound budgetary

practices will be strictly followed in regard to expenses incurred through the functioning of the agencies and organs created by the Convention.

404. Despite those few reservations that I have just expressed, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1.

405. We take this opportunity to express our gratitude to Mr. Hyera of the United Republic of Tanzania and to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea, Mr. Nandan, for the efforts they have made to ensure that this draft resolution would be acceptable to the largest possible number of delegations.

406. Mr. van LANSCHOT (Netherlands): Some of the important developments that took place during the 1984 session of the Preparatory Commission were the result of extensive informal consultations among the States concerned. However, they were the object of little or no discussion at the meetings of the Preparatory Commission. This is the case, in particular, of the understanding that was reached at the Geneva meeting among the four States that announced their intention to submit applications for their registration as pioneer investors—France, India, Japan and the Soviet Union. That understanding, which is called "Understanding on Resolution of Conflicts among Applicants for Registration as Pioneer Investors", relates to the procedure and a timetable for resolution of any conflicts that may arise from overlapping of areas claimed by these applicants. On 31 August 1984, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission made a statement in which he reported that "an understanding has been reached among the parties concerned". That statement and the understanding itself are contained in document LOS/PCN/L.8. The same statement was repeated by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission on 4 September and is contained in paragraph 8 of document LOS/PCN/L.13.

407. Despite the statements made by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, it appears that some confusion has arisen with respect to the nature and scope of that understanding. We wish to refer in this regard to the Secretary-General's report on the Law of the Sea [*A/39/647 and Corr.1 and Add.1*]. This is a very informative and well-prepared paper, which contains in particular, in its paragraphs 80 to 93, a description of the work accomplished by the Preparatory Commission during 1984. In general, this description is a good and accurate summary but, perhaps as a result of an obvious and commendable concern for brevity, it contains two statements that in our view deserve further clarification.

408. Paragraph 83 of the report states, *inter alia*, the following:

> "The Commission has decided that, following the adoption of the rules for the registration of pioneer investors, it will proceed to register the first group of applicants at the third session of the Preparatory Commission to be held in Kingston from 11 March to 5 April 1985. In the mean time the Commission has requested the first group of applicants to resolve as soon as possible conflicts with respect to the overlapping of the areas claimed."

Paragraph 86 states: "At the end of the Geneva meeting the Chairman announced that an understanding had been reached on the procedure and on a timetable for conflict resolution for the first group of applicants."

409. Paragraph 86 is ambiguous, in that it fails to specify, as was done by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, that this understanding was not reached by the Preparatory Commission but by the parties concerned. In order to avoid misunderstandings, I may add that the words "parties concerned" do not refer to the Members of the Group of 77 on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other hand—that is, the States that participated in the informal consultations conducted by Mr. Warioba. No, the words "the parties concerned" refer only to France, India, Japan and the Soviet Union. The wording of paragraph 83 simply is not accurate, because it is based on language used in the understanding in question; it has not been endorsed, directly or indirectly, by the Preparatory Commission and has not been the object of any decision by the Preparatory Commission.

410. The very notion of a "first group of applicants" has not been used by the Preparatory Commission or by its Chairman, except by reference to the terms of the understanding itself. It is an expression limited only to the understanding that was reached by the four States concerned. The only decision that the Preparatory Commission itself took with respect to negotiations of pioneer investors is contained in paragraph 14 of document LOS/PCN/L.13 and it is to "complete the consideration of the draft rules on pioneer investors and adopt them". Both part I and part II of the understanding therefore reflect the views of the parties to that understanding only, and as such have no effect on other States.

411. More specifically, I wish to state the following. The rules and regulations will have to be drawn up on their own merits, that is, without reference to the understanding among the four States. The fact that those four States reached an understanding among themselves cannot prejudge the freedom of discretion or the responsibility of each member State as regards its participation in the decision-making process—notably in the General Committee—with regard to the registration of applications. In this context, I may add that in our view the issue of conflict resolution can be satisfactorily solved only by agreements which encompass all parties that may be affected by overlapping on any particular site.

412. We are aware, of course, that the report of the Secretary-General was prepared for informational purposes only, and, as I indicated earlier, it is a very helpful document. However, the only authoritative statements on the work of the Preparatory Commission are those contained in its official documents. Nevertheless, given the misperceptions that may have developed with respect to the stage reached by the Preparatory Commission in its consideration of the registration of pioneer investors, we thought it might be helpful to clarify the matter at this stage.

413. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1. It is our position that the "Provisional Understanding regarding Deep Sea-Bed Matters" concluded on 3 August 1984 between eight Governments, my own among them, falls outside the scope of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

414. My delegation would like to emphasize that the Provisional Understanding, being essentially an agreement to avoid conflicts arising from overlapping claims to mining sites, does not contain in any

way an alternative deep sea-bed mining régime. The Provisional Understanding is without prejudice to the Convention on the Law of the Sea and does not affect the position of the Government of the Netherlands with regard to that Convention.

415. Mr. TREVES (Italy): Italy signed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on 7 December. Well aware of the importance of the Convention and of the expectations of many countries of the world, especially the developing countries, Italy decided that its place has to be among the countries signatory to the Convention. It would, moreover, have been difficult for Italy to detach itself from the results of all the labour undertaken in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction and in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, a labour in which it had participated actively and responsibly through the years.

416. The Convention is, in our view, an important contribution to the enhancement of the rule of law in a very important sector of international law. It clarifies many issues which have hitherto given rise to political tension and disputes by striking a reasonable balance between old and new, between codification and progressive development of international law. It reconciles in a way that by and large we consider acceptable the traditional, but still vitally important, concept based on the freedom of the high seas and on protection of navigation and communications with both the new aspiration to the widening of coastal States' jurisdiction over resource-related matters and the new concerns common to all States, such as those related to the preservation of the marine environment. Moreover, the Convention gives a comparatively wide scope to compulsory third-party settlement of disputes, an aspect that Italy, in conformity with its tradition, considers of the highest importance.

417. It is well known that Italy has considerable difficulty with provisions of the Convention dealing with deep sea-bed mining. These difficulties explain our hesitation before signing the Convention. Even though we think that the Preparatory Commission, in whose work we have actively participated as observers, is making good progress, these difficulties still exist. We stated them explicitly at the moment of signing, as did other States. We were pleased to note that, when signing the Convention on 7 December, the representative of the European Community made a statement along similar lines also.

418. We have examined the Secretary-General's report on the law of the sea [*A/39/647 and Corr.1 and Add.1*] with great interest. We consider it a very useful and informative document, and we welcome it.

419. One of the aspects of the report that strikes my delegation as particularly interesting is that it puts in perspective deep sea-bed mining *vis-à-vis* the other sea-related activities. The picture one gathers from the report is that of an extremely wide and complex set of problems and activities that go far beyond those connected with deep sea-bed mining, which are rather specific and mostly projected well into the future. As is true for the sea-related activities and interests of the States, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the activities of the United Nations and of its Law of the Sea Office related to the sea, as well as those of other international organizations, have a much broader scope than deep-sea mining, notwithstanding the fact that public attention has focused on that aspect in recent years.

420. This confirms the wisdom of the attitude taken by the Italian Government when it decided to sign the Convention, notwithstanding its conviction that part XI and annexes 3 and 4, which refer to deep seabed mining, contain considerable flaws and deficiencies. We were pleased to note that, in commenting on the reaching of the 159th signature on the closing date of 9 December, the Secretary-General recognized the position of the States which "though supporting the Convention as a whole, find the deep sea-bed mining part of it not entirely satisfactory". We were pleased in particular to read in that statement of the Secretary-General that "In areas where divergences remain, we will endeavour to bring about reconciliation" and that "this can be achieved through flexibility, understanding and goodwill on all sides, so that we can make this global achievement a truly universal one". This is the very objective Italy will strive to achieve, especially, but not exclusively, through its full participation in the Preparatory Commission.

421. In connection with the report of the Secretary-General, we have listened with interest to the observations made by Canada, Belgium and the Netherlands with regard to paragraphs 83 and 86. We agree with the remark that those paragraphs are somewhat misleading. Even though this report does not purport to contain the records of the Preparatory Commission, those paragraphs might give the impression that the Preparatory Commission has in some way taken a decision on the understanding reached by France, India, Japan and the Soviet Union.

422. We have listened to statements in the present debate mentioning the Provisional Understanding signed on 3 August by eight States, including Italy. In some of those statements, the Provisional Understanding has been qualified as illegal. It has also been said that it contains a new régime for the exploitation of the international sea-bed.

423. My delegation, together with those of Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, is on record with a firm rejection of those contentions, which are not new. We wish to recall the statement made on behalf of these countries by the chairman of the Netherlands delegation at the Preparatory Commission meeting on 14 August 1984, which is reproduced in document LOS/PCN/52. Repeating what was said in that declaration, we wish to state firmly that there is no single provision in the Provisional Understanding that would make it illegal. Moreover, the Provisional Understanding does not provide for a new régime for the exploration and exploitation of the international sea-bed as an alternative to that of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The Provisional Understanding is essentially concerned with conflict resolution, and as such it corresponds to one of the basic principles of international law—and, we may add, it is perfectly in line with resolution II.

424. As regards draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1, which is submitted to us for approval, we were pleased to participate in the discussions that led to its submission. Its text is very similar to that of resolution 38/59 A, which was approved last year,

and, in our opinion, its meaning and effect are the same.

425. We are pleased to announce that as a consequence of our signing the Convention this year we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution. We wish, however, to stress that our concern for the rigorous administration of United Nations resources in this as in other areas remains the same. That is why in the Fifth Committee our delegation abstained on the financial implications of this draft resolution. Indeed, we would wish that the Preparatory Commission would take more into account the fact that it is financed through the ordinary budget of the United Nations and orient itself to the least expensive choices in developing the programme for its meetings.

426. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The annual debate on the law of the sea makes it possible for the General Assembly to draw up a balance sheet of developments with regard to the subject of the law of the sea that have occurred during the past year. For this year, the balance sheet has certainly been positive.

427. First of all, having signed the Convention on 10 December 1982 we can but be pleased at its support by the international community, which is illustrated in a particularly striking way by the exceptionally large number of signatures to the Convention since it was opened for signature. Forty new signatures have been added to those inscribed at the Convention at Montego Bay, bringing the total to 159.

428. The support given the Convention is also clearly demonstrated by the fact that every geographical region and all political, economic and social systems are broadly represented. We are particularly pleased by the large number of signatures by European countries, and in particular by those of our partners in the European Economic Community, which itself signed the Convention on 7 December of last year. As the Secretary-General emphasized in his statement on 10 December, "Such overwhelming support for a Convention of this universal character is unprecedented."

429. At the same time, the Secretary-General recalled that some States that support the Convention as a whole feel that the section on the exploitation of the sea-bed is not entirely satisfactory. He has promised to pursue efforts to reconcile positions in areas where differences remain.

430. We feel that that positive and constructive attitude should be shared by all Members of the Organization if we wish to give the Convention a truly universal nature. In this regard, we welcome the progress made by the Preparatory Commission and its Special Commissions during the recent sessions at Kingston and at Geneva. The Preparatory Commission has, generally speaking, proved itself serious and realistic under the leadership of its Chairman, Mr. Warioba, to whom we pay a tribute for his outstanding guidance of the Commission's work. It is under his leadership, in particular, that decisive progress has been made in the implementation of resolution II of the Conference, notably in the agreement of 30 August 1984 on the settlement of disputes between persons wishing to register as pioneer investors and on the procedure for the settlement of disputes between applicants in the first group.

431. These applicants in the first group are those that presented applications to the Preparatory Commission prior to 9 December 1984: that is, France, India, Japan and the Soviet Union. As a representative of one of those countries, I feel it appropriate to inform the Assembly of the present state of the implementation of the agreement of 30 August. The delegations of the four countries met in Geneva from 3 to 6 December in accordance with the agreement. On that occasion they drew up an agreement to ensure the confidential nature of data and information and a procés-verbal setting out the terms for the exchange of co-ordinates. Those two texts are to be signed on 17 December this year. On the same day, according to the 30 August agreement, delegations should exchange co-ordinates and identify possible overlapping. We hope that in the case of such overlapping, the negotiations scheduled for next January will enable us to resolve all the pending problems prior to the third regular session of the Preparatory Commission which is to meet at Kingston, from 11 March to 4 April 1985.

432. All these developments cause us to feel optimistic about the continuance of the work of the Preparatory Commission, provided that a constructive atmosphere continues to reign. I can assure the Assembly that our delegation will continue its active participation in this work with the same open spirit it has always shown.

433. Taking into account the aforementioned developments and the other activities carried out efficiently by the Secretary-General in implementation of the ambitious programme relating to questions connected with the law of the sea as set forth in the medium-term plan, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us, as it has with similar draft resolutions in the past.

434. Although the future of the Convention on the Law of the Sea should lead us all to show receptiveness and mutual understanding, we regret that some delegations have seen fit to give a polemical turn to our debate by reiterating totally unjustified accusations with respect to the Provisional Understanding regarding Deep Sea-Bed Matters, signed on 3 August 1984 by eight countries, including France. Contrary to what some might say, that arrangement is in no way contrary to the Convention and does not aim at establishing a régime parallel to it.

435. This arrangement does not imply any legal recognition by the signatories of the validity of permits that might be issued on the sole basis of national legislation.

436. The sole objective of the arrangement actually is to remove the possibility of future conflicts between the signatories. Thus, in eliminating potential sources of conflict, it is in line with the intentions of the sponsors of resolution II. It is therefore perfectly compatible with the obligation accepted by the French Government to undertake activities in the deep sea-bed, in the context of resolution II, as is shown by the lodging of our application for registration as a pioneer investor with the Preparatory Commission.

437. There is therefore no foundation for the criticisms of certain delegations. Do they believe that, if we had the slightest doubt as to the compatibility of this arrangement with the Convention, we would be able to vote for draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1, whose paragraph 5, and I quote, "*Calls*

upon States to desist from taking actions which undermine the Convention or defeat its object and purpose"?

438. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cape Verde for a point of order.

439. Mr. JESUS (Cape Verde): In raising this point of order, Mr. President, my delegation would like to draw your attention to an apparent discrepancy between the French text and the English text of draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1. This draft resolution was negotiated in English among some interested delegations, and the French text was translated from English. My delegation would have refrained from making the following comments if the French text did not make substantial changes to what was negotiated by those interested delegations, the content of which is clearly reflected in the English text.

440. I think that the French text must reflect the exact content of the results of the negotiations that took place, which, as I said, are very clearly reflected in the English text. Therefore, because of the very detailed nature of the compromise reached at the time of the negotiations, my delegation suggests, on the basis of consultations it carried out with the interested delegations, mainly French-speaking delegations, that the following changes be made in the French text.

441. First, I would draw attention to paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1. In the English text, it is correctly stated that the General Assembly "*Calls upon* all States that have not done so to consider ratifying or acceding . . .". In the French text, as we see, it is stated that the Assembly "*Demande* aux Etats qui ne l'ont pas encore fait d'envisager de signer et de ratifier . . .".*

442. That is not only inconsistent with the English text, but also unrealistic. It is not possible to demand or call upon States to sign the Convention when we know the Convention is no longer open to signature, because the closing date for that was 9 December. The French text of paragraph 3 should therefore read as follows:

> "*Demande* à tous les Etats qui ne l'ont pas encore fait d'envisager de ratifier la Convention ou d'y adhérer dans les meilleurs délais en vue de permettre l'entrée en vigueur du nouveau régime juridique des utilisations de la mer et de ses ressources;".*

443. With regard to paragraph 5, I think that the French version as it stands now is quite far from what was negotiated this year and is reflected in the corresponding paragraph of the English text. In fact, the French text reflects the corresponding paragraphs of last year's resolution. This was quite clearly changed during the negotiations. Therefore I would suggest that the French version of paragraph 5 should reflect the compromise which was reached with such difficulty this year. After having consulted with French-speaking delegations and other interested delegations, I suggest that the Translation Service take into account the following text of the French version of paragraph 5:

> "*Demande* aux Etats . . ."—and not ". . . à tous les Etats"—"de renoncer aux actions"—and not "toute action"—"sapant l'efficacité de la Convention ou allant à l'encontre de son objet et de son but;".*

This last part, "de son objet et de son but", is in accordance with what has been retained in paragraph 5 of the English text, and it is only a transcription of an equivalent expression from the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.[5]

444. With regard to paragraph 9, I think that in the second line of the French version, where it says "conception cohérente", it should say "une approche cohérente". Therefore it is merely a question of replacing the word "conception" by the word "approche". In the fifth line of the same paragraph, two words have been left out; where we say [the General Assembly] "invite les institutions et organismes des Nations Unies . . .", we should say ". . .invite les institutions et organismes du système des Nations Unies", to put the wording in accordance with the normal practice in this sort of text and also with the English text.

445. Passing now to the preambular part of the draft resolution, some French colleagues advised, since I was going to propose these corrections to the French text, that I also propose that in the third line of the sixth preambular paragraph, where mention is made of "services consultatifs", it should merely say "conseils", and would then read: ". . . de conseils et d'assistance . . .".

446. As I have said, these comments are made with the sole objective of assuring that the content of the negotiations which took place this year in the preparation of draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1 should be reflected as clearly as possible. The wording I have just proposed results, as I said, from consultations among interested delegations, and particularly with those of francophone countries.

447. To conclude, after consulting with some interested delegations—among which are sponsors, as is my delegation, of the draft resolution—and taking into account that the target date for signature of the Convention, 9 December, has passed, and that the number of States and of all entities that have signed the Convention has reached 159, my delegation suggests a small, inoffensive oral amendment to the second line of the second preambular paragraph, where "et notamment les 114 signatures" would be replaced by "et notamment les cent cinquante-neuf signatures". Since this is a factual suggestion, I think it will not counter opposition from any representative here present, and while it is an oral amendment, that it can be adopted.

448. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like to congratulate the representative of Cape Verde on his meticulous approach and his perfect command of the French language, and to state that we have no objections whatsoever to the changes he has proposed to the French text of the draft resolution. We wish to speak now simply because we have noticed, in looking again more closely at the draft, that there is another error in the translation of paragraph 3. At the beginning of the English text, it reads "all the States", and in the French version the word "all" was not translated. The French text should therefore read "*Demande* à tous les Etats qui ne l'ont pas encore fait. . .".

449. Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Comparing the Spanish text and the English text of the draft resolution, it seems we would have a similar problem in paragraph 5. The words "a todos" would have to be deleted to keep the Spanish version consistent with the English and

---

*Quoted in French by the speaker.

French texts as suggested by the representative of Cape Verde.

450. The PRESIDENT: With regard to the points of order raised by the representatives of Cape Verde, France and Bolivia, I can inform the Assembly that I have been advised by the Secretariat that its technical services will ensure that the final edited versions in French and Spanish conform fully to the English text. I hope that satisfies the points of order.

451. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1.

452. Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): The views of the Turkish Government concerning the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea are well known and have been put on the record in oral and written statements during all the sessions of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, including the last one held at Montego Bay. The Government of Turkey has signed neither the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea nor the Final Act of the Conference. Furthermore, Turkey voted against General Assembly resolutions 37/66 and 38/59 A, adopted under the item "Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea".

453. The Turkish Government has recently decided to participate as an observer in the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission, in accordance with article 3 of its rules of procedure. However, the position of the Turkish Government regarding the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea remains unchanged. Consequently, the participation of the Turkish Government as an observer in the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission can in no way be interpreted or construed as indicating that Turkey has changed its stated views and positions.

454. With regard to the budget implications of the draft resolutions concerning the law of the sea, the Turkish Government is of the opinion that the expenditures emanating from the implementation of the Convention are not juridically eligible to be met from the budget of the United Nations and that they should be borne and met solely by the signatories and parties to it, as required by international law. For this reason, Turkey has voted against proposals to this effect in the Fifth Committee.

455. My delegation would like to request that the draft resolution contained in A/39/L.35 and Add.1 be put to a recorded vote.

456. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As the international community is aware, the delegation of Ecuador did not sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, as it does not completely reflect fundamental Ecuadorian rights and interests. However, our country contributed to a great extent, together with the developing coastal countries, to the enshrinement of important principles in favour of their rights over all the living natural resources in their seas up to the 200-mile limit, regardless of their habits, while those species are within a country's marine environment, as well as the corresponding sea-bed under national jurisdiction.

457. Ecuador has also reiterated—and will continue to reiterate—its position of support for the right to exploit, utilize and market, according to the principle of the common heritage of mankind, the marine areas beyond the national jurisdiction of the coastal countries. Therefore, we cannot accept any unilateral exploitation which could directly or indirectly weaken that principle.

458. Consequently, Ecuador will not participate in the vote on the draft resolution on the law of the sea.

459. The PRESIDENT: Before putting draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1 to the vote, I should like to announce that there are two additional sponsors of the draft resolution: Costa Rica and Trinidad and Tobago. The Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on the draft resolution. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/39/821. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Turkey, United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela.

The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/73).

460. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes.

461. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): The Albanian delegation did not participate in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/39/L.35 and Add.1, for the same reasons it had when it did not participate in the vote on the text of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and its signature. On various occasions, the Albanian delegation has clearly expressed the views and position of its Government on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which are recorded in the official documents of the Conference.

462. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania maintains its known position on the interpretation of the provisions of the law of the sea. As with resolutions of previous sessions, draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1 contains some provisions unacceptable to the Albanian delegation. Since we explained our reservations on these provisions during the last session, in order not to take up the time of the Assembly, we shall not enter into the details of the reservations, which we still maintain.

463. Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation abstained in the voting on the resolution just adopted. The Federal Republic of Germany considers a comprehensive, generally acceptable law of the sea régime an important contribution to the rule of law in international relations. The parts of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea which relate to international law of the sea proper, to the protection of the marine environment and to the settlement of disputes have met with general approval. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes those parts of the Convention as a major contribution to the codification and progressive development of international law of the sea which can play an important role in ensuring the clarity and certainty of law.

464. However, a consensus among all States on the Convention as a whole failed to transpire on account of the envisaged sea-bed mining régime. The Federal Republic of Germany has consistently expressed the opinion that substantial modifications will be necessary in order to establish a generally acceptable régime in this field as well. The preparatory investment protection scheme also reveals considerable flaws and inconsistencies. Under the present circumstances, this system offers no safeguards for protection of the interests of the Federal Republic of Germany.

465. Taking into account all these considerations, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany decided not to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. However, this does not mean that it rejects the Convention. My Government will continue to work with other countries to bring about a sea-bed mining régime that will eventually make the Convention acceptable to all States.

466. I should now like to refer to a previous intervention which dealt with the seat of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. The free and Hanseatic city of Hamburg has been determined as the seat of the Tribunal in article 1, paragraph 2, of annex VI to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. This decision stands. It has not been linked to the signing of the Convention by the Federal Republic of Germany but has been made dependent on my country having ratified the Convention by the time of its entry into force. In this regard, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea has rightly pointed out recently that the Federal Republic of Germany can still accede to the Convention at any time.

467. We have listened to an intervention asserting that the Provisional Understanding regarding deep-sea matters to which my country is a party contradicts the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. As other parties to the Understanding have already pointed out this evening, this is a misinterpretation of the content and object of the Understanding. Its objective is to avoid conflicting claims among the parties now and in the future by mutual self-restraint. The Understanding thus serves a principle which has been expressed in paragraph 5 (*a*) of resolution II of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

468. Mr. RIVERA MARAVÍ (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru, on the express instructions of its Government, abstained in the voting on this draft resolution, without failing to recognize, however, the historical significance of the Convention.

469. Since 1947, Peru has actively demonstrated before the international community its recognition of the sovereignty of coastal States over their territorial waters, from their coasts to the 200-mile limit and over their sea-bed sectors. Therefore my delegation thinks that it has contributed to a certain extent to the creation of this new law.

470. Finally, my delegation wishes to make clear that the existence of certain differences between the provisions of the Convention and the Constitution of Peru have made it impossible for Peru to subscribe to this Convention.

471. Mrs. VARNAI-DRANGER (Israel): In this regard, the Government of Israel states that the régime of navigation and overflight, confirmed by the 1979 Treaty of Peace between Israel and Egypt, in which the straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba are considered by the parties to be international waterways open to all nations for unimpeded and non-suspendable freedom of navigation and overflight, is applicable to the said areas. Moreover, being fully compatible with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the régime of the Peace Treaty will continue to prevail and to be applicable to the said areas.

472. It is the understanding of the Government of Israel that in this regard the declaration of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon its ratification of the Convention is consonant with the above declaration. Israel remains committed, of course, to those rules of general international law in respect of peaceful uses of the seas and oceans.

473. At the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly, my delegation expressed its opposition to the proposal to include the budget of the Preparatory Commission within the general budget of the United Nations, and that remains our position. But that does not apply, of course, to the general functions of the Secretary-General relating to marine affairs.

474. We have carefully studied the report of the Secretary-General on the law of the sea [*A/39/647 and Corr.1 and Add.1*]. We have noted with appreciation the ongoing activities of the Secretariat. We have also noted that the report includes information on various activities relating to marine affairs, including private law activities. It may be recalled that my delegation suggested last year that such information be included in the *Law of the Sea Bulletin*. The *Bulletin* is very useful, and we would like to suggest once again that consideration be given to expanding the co-ordinating role of the Secretariat by including in the *Bulletin* information on marine affairs, of both public and private law character, and both within and outside the framework of the United Nations.

475. There is no need to stress here once again my country's interest in the sea and our active participa-

tion in all international consultations and conferences on the law of the sea. The position of my country on the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is also very well known and has been put on record more than once.

476. From our point of view, the Convention contains provisions which have been introduced on grounds of political considerations totally extraneous to the law of the sea and which did not allow my country to sign the Convention. In this regard, we have asked the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention, to circulate the following statement:

> "The concerns of the Government of Israel with regard to the law of the sea relate principally to the ensuring of maximum freedom of navigation and overflight everywhere, and particularly through straits used for international navigation."

477. Mr. BERMAN (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the United Kingdom's abstention on draft resolution A/39/L.35 and Add.1, which has just been adopted. It is well known why the United Kingdom, for reasons which I will mention in a moment, has not signed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It must, therefore, be clear to all that there are many aspects of the resolution just adopted which we could not support.

478. The United Kingdom's particular objections to various aspects of this resolution were explained in detail in my delegation's explanation of vote on the equivalent resolution of the thirty-seventh session [*91st meeting*]. Moreover, in certain respects, the language of the present resolution represents a step further back from the language of General Assembly resolutions 37/66 and 38/59 A and contains elements which are not justified by the facts.

479. My delegation indicated in 1982 that the Government of the United Kingdom had decided against early signature of the Convention because it could not accept the régime for deep sea-bed mining, including the transfer of technology, in its present form. The decision was made, however, bearing in mind that the Convention remained open for signature for two years, to explore the prospects of improvements in these areas, starting with the rules, regulations and procedures to be drawn up in the Preparatory Commission, in whose work the United Kingdom has played a full part.

480. My Government has now completed a full review of its policy in the light of the experience of the past two years, but has concluded that there has been no significant change from the position that existed in 1982. While there is, therefore, no basis for a decision to sign the Convention in 1984, I wish to emphasize, as my delegation did in 1982, that the search for a consensus must continue. It remains the sole wish of the United Kingdom to see the development of provisions relating to sea-bed mining which could be accepted by consensus among the whole international community. Let me also mention at this point that my Government, when announcing its decision not to sign the Convention, also indicated that it would not stand in the way of signature by the European community within the limits of its competence as regards the Convention. This has since taken place, on 7 December.

481. I should like to make it plain that my delegation's reservations about the resolution just adopted should not be taken as casting aspersions on the efforts made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in pursuance of the tasks laid upon them by previous resolutions of the General Assembly. I should like specifically to join in the appreciation expressed in various paragraphs of the resolution for the Secretary-General's undertakings in relation to the law of the sea as a whole.

482. I regret that I have to conclude this brief statement by referring to a question which should not have been raised, but was raised in a flourish of rhetoric by two representatives who chose to use the present occasion as a platform for criticizing the policies and actions of others. The arguments raised, especially by the representative of the Soviet Union, were not new, but their repetition does not, of course, mean that they are any less unfounded for that, as has already been demonstrated by previous speakers.

483. My delegation associates itself fully with the remarks made by the representatives of Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy, and by others, in this respect.

484. Mr. RAY (United States of America): Once again my delegation has had to cast a negative vote on a resolution concerning the international development of the law of the sea. As in the past, we have done so with considerable reluctance. We do so primarily because of the insistence by many delegations that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the institutions it seeks to create remain a direct fiscal responsibility of the Organization.

485. The United States, as we have stated in the past, views the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as a major accomplishment in the development of international law relating to the oceans. Unfortunately, the Convention contains one part, part XI, which runs contrary to United States policy and to that of others that share our views concerning the future development of resources on the bottom of the deep sea-bed. Therefore, the United States has not signed the Convention.

486. The United Nations is still being requested to fund, from its general budget, the Preparatory Commission established by the Convention. The United States believes that the costs of the Preparatory Commission should be borne by those nations which are parties to the Treaty. Such costs cannot be assessed against all United Nations members as part of the United Nations budget, as they do not represent legitimate "expenses of the Organization" within the meaning of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

487. The United States remains steadfast in its opposition to such improper assessments, and we are determined to resist such abuses of the budget and the Charter of the United Nations. The Preparatory Commission is established pursuant to a Treaty régime separate from the Charter of the United Nations. It is legally independent of, and distinct from, the United Nations, and it is not answerable to the United Nations. Membership of the United Nations does not obligate any member to finance or otherwise to support any other independent organization.

488. The United States will not support that part of the Convention which deals with deep sea-bed development, and the United States will continue to withhold its *pro rata* share of the United Nations annual assessment for the regular budget which pertains to the funding of the Preparatory Commis-

sion and is earmarked to part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. However, the United States takes this opportunity to reiterate its commitment to co-operate with the international community on the development of international law relating to the oceans. This co-operation extends to a vast number of important principles contained in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

489. With regard to the statement of the Soviet Union, which mentioned the United States—without compliment—we concur with the substance of the position expressed tonight by the representatives of Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom.

490. Mr. HAYASHI (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. In this connection, we very much regret the criticism made by certain delegations earlier in the debate of the agreement, or more accurately, the provisional understanding recently concluded by eight Governments regarding these deep sea-bed matters. As the representatives of Italy and other countries clearly explained, that criticism is totally unfounded and irrelevant.

491. My delegation would like to reaffirm its position as communicated to the Preparatory Commission on 3 August 1984 and recorded in document LOS/PCN/45, that the Provisional Understanding is fully compatible with the commitment of the Government of Japan to undertake its deep sea-bed activities within the framework of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and resolution II of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

492. We understand that paragraph 5 of the resolution just adopted contains a general appeal not to take any action which would undermine the Convention or defeat its object and purpose, and that it has nothing to do with the Provisional Understanding.

493. Mr. VILLAGRA DELGADO (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Argentina interprets the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of the resolution that has just been adopted in accordance with the declaration it made on 5 October 1984, upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and especially with the last paragraph of that declaration.

494. In this connection, it is my Government's understanding that of the resolutions adopted together with the Convention for procedural reasons, the only ones related to it for functional reasons are resolution I and II, and that therefore it is to them that the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of the resolution just adopted refer.

495. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In this brief final statement I should like to say how pleased we are at the adoption of this very important resolution and to congratulate the delegations concerned. Unfortunately, some delegations persist in their policy of obstructing the Convention. We saw that during the voting.

496. We would like to state that during the debate, efforts were made to interpret the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Any interpretation incompatible with its purposes, principles and provisions is prohibited, and therefore any effort in that direction has no legal meaning. Attempts were also made during the debate arbitrarily to interpret the resolutions adopted by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which contains definite procedures and provisions that are self-explanatory. Any arbitrary attempt to interpret those resolutions in a way that runs counter to their spirit and letter and to their provisions has no legal validity and cannot be presented here as legal.

AGENDA ITEM 35

United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy: Report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

497. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Egypt.

498. Mr. SHAKER (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am pleased to be the first speaker on this item in order to introduce, on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany, Poland and my own country, draft resolution A/39/L.26.

499. The draft resolution consists of six preambular paragraphs and nine operative paragraphs. I need not go into the details, as I am sure all delegations are aware of its contents. However, I should like to underline its salient features which have been introduced this year, especially in the light of the success achieved by the Preparatory Committee during its fifth session, held at Vienna from 25 June to 6 July 1984. The main features of the draft resolution are as follows.

500. First, the General Assembly approves the recommendations and decisions contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy on its fifth session [*A/39/47*]. Secondly, the Assembly expresses its appreciation of the efforts of the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, Mr. Novak Pribicević of Yugoslavia, and the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Mehta, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/60. Indeed, the efforts made by the Chairman and Mr. Mehta were instrumental in ensuring the success of the fifth session of the Preparatory Committee in a manner not witnessed in any of the previous sessions. During the period from January to May 1984 they conducted several rounds of informal consultations with members of the Preparatory Committee individually and collectively as well as with regional groups which so desired. Thirdly, in view of the constructive efforts made by the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and the Secretary-General of the Conference, the General Assembly requests the Chairman and the Secretary-General of the Conference to continue informal individual and group consultations, as necessary, in order to assist the Committee in expediting the necessary procedural and substantive preparations for the Conference. Fourthly, the General Assembly decides that the Preparatory Committee will hold its sixth session at Vienna from 21 October to 1 November 1985 to consider, *inter alia*, the mechanism for formal/official inter-sessional intergovernmental work and the commencement of preparation of the concluding document or documents of the Conference, as well as the mandate and composition of the group of internationally eminent

experts. Fifthly, the General Assembly decides that the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy will be held at Geneva from 10 to 28 November 1986. Sixthly, the General Assembly invites the International Atomic Energy Agency, the specialized agencies and other relevant organizations of the United Nations system to ensure that their contributions to the documents for the Conference, including reports of the regional expert group meetings, should be concise and comprehensive and specifically related to the purpose, aims and objectives of the Conference, including in particular suggestions regarding practical and effective ways and means for the promotion of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, so as to achieve meaningful results from the Conference in accordance with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 32/50. Lastly, the General Assembly invites all States to co-operate actively in the preparation of the Conference and to make available, as soon as possible, the information requested in paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 36/78 and in the broad questionnaire circulated by the Secretary-General of the Conference in March 1984.

501. Those are the important elements of the draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, Poland and Egypt. We hope that the General Assembly will adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

502. I should like to take this opportunity to express our special appreciation to the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Mehta, for the excellent and outstanding work he has carried out with extreme skill, in view of the specialized and delicate aspects of the Conference, and the importance and nature of the items to be covered by it. We are pleased to see the difficult task of the preparations for the Conference in such able hands, because he is known for his wide diplomatic experience and his expertise in this vital field. Moreover, Mr. Mehta is devoting his efforts entirely to achieving the objectives of the Conference in an admirable way. We are confident that the Conference will be thoroughly prepared under his supervision. We therefore request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to provide all necessary facilities in order to enable him to carry out his task fully and successfully.

503. Egypt, which participated actively in the work of the Preparatory Committee under the wise leadership of Yugoslavia, believes that the objective of the Conference should be to discuss all the dimensions of international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in order to develop the principles of international co-operation and to devise the ways of developing that co-operation in accordance with resolution 32/50, that is, under the mutually acceptable considerations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. We hope that the Conference will achieve positive results to ensure the use of nuclear energy in fields such as medicine, industry, food and agriculture. Undoubtedly we should not look at the forthcoming Conference in isolation from other events taking place in other international forums connected with the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, such as the Third Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as well as the work of the Committee on Supply Assurances.

504. In conclusion, we believe that the forthcoming Conference should take into consideration the United Nations resolutions which established it, in particular those regarding the role of nuclear energy in economic development in the developing countries, taking into account their sovereign rights in developing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in accordance with their priorities and their right to acquire nuclear technology under appropriate international guarantees.

505. Mr. DJOKIĆ (Yugoslavia): Seven years ago, the General Assembly launched an important initiative aimed at creating an equitable and just basis of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The intention of that action was to determine principles and to reach a new international consensus which would serve as the basis for relations and the promotion of co-operation in that field. In the period since the last General Assembly session, there have been several positive developments. Conditions have improved for substantial work on the preparations for the Conference, to which undivided significance is attached and which is of particular importance for all countries, especially the developing ones. At the last session of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference, which was held at Vienna from 25 June to 6 July 1984, significant progress was achieved. Views on pending controversial issues were successfully reconciled, and generally acceptable solutions regarding the content of the agenda of the Conference and its decision-making procedure were found; thus the Preparatory Committee has been enabled to concentrate in its future work on substantial preparations for the Conference. We wish to express our satisfaction at the results achieved by the Committee and the readiness displayed to retain in future work the spirit of mutual understanding, accommodation and flexibility. Such a development has long been desired. We hope that this trend will continue and develop further, in view of the fact that we are still faced with some issues awaiting agreement before the holding of the conference in 1986.

506. The provision of adequate sources of energy is one of the essential prerequisites for general economic and social development, so much needed in the greater part of the world. That is why the questions of access to and utilization of those sources are an inevitable and urgent task in the solution of which all countries should participate on the basis of equality. It is only natural that the developing countries should attach exceptional significance to the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. Most of those countries are faced with specific difficulties, being poor in sources of energy. It is obvious that they cannot rely only on traditional sources of energy and that to do so would pose yet another obstacle to their development. In order to meet the energy needs of their development, they have to start preparing or speeding up the implementation of programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without further loss of time. It is therefore of utmost importance that the problems and the obstacles be urgently addressed, as this adverse situation is not in keeping with the envisaged undisturbed transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, with the creation of overall co-operation in this sphere on

the basis of full equality, with common interests and sustained development throughout the world. The way out is obviously not in the strengthening and enhancement of the monopoly over nuclear technology held by a small number of countries, but in a persistent search for solutions that will serve the interests of all countries, particularly the developing ones.

507. The question of utilizing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and the issue of transfer of nuclear technology are often linked with the question of the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. There is no doubt that all elements that can contribute to such a development deserve due attention. The Third Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will be held next year. That will be an opportunity to consider comprehensively the implementation of the Treaty and to determine the extent to which the goals set by the Treaty have been realized and how the States Parties have respected the obligations assumed under the Treaty. It will also be an opportunity to consider all aspects of and dangers arising from the proliferation of nuclear weapons, regarding both the horizontal and the vertical components of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

508. We have pointed out on several occasions that the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear weapons should not be used as a pretext for preventing, or an obstacle to the promotion of, co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We are convinced that the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy and meaningful results arising from it will confirm the correctness of that position.

509. In the light of the latest positive indications, we believe that there is a realistic basis for the fulfilment of the objectives by which the General Assembly was guided when it launched action for convening the Conference. The Conference should define universally acceptable principles in the sphere of the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and thus contribute to fruitful co-operation in this regard.

510. We are aware of the high degree of interdependence that exists in this field. That is why we believe that there is mutual interest between the developing countries which are importers of equipment and supplies and the countries which are exporters of nuclear technology. In this regard, we attach particular importance to the work of the IAEA, especially in providing assistance in training for the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

511. With regard to further preparations for the Conference, we attach particular importance to the inter-sessional work of the appropriate intergovernmental body and to the elaboration of final documents for the Conference. We also consider to be of special importance the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee regarding informal individual and group consultations by the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, Mr. Pribicević, and the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Mehta, to speed up the work on the preparations for the Conference. Such practices have proved valuable in the past, and we are convinced that the involvement of these persons would contribute considerably to faster harmonization of views.

512. This would create the necessary pre-conditions for the solid preparation of the Conference and would contribute to its successful outcome, to which Yugoslavia and other developing countries attach particular importance.

513. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/39/L.26. The programme budget implications of this draft resolution appear in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/822*]. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/39/L.26?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/74).

AGENDA ITEM 120

Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 121

Observer status of national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 122

Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 123

Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States

AGENDA ITEM 124

Peaceful settlement of disputes between States

AGENDA ITEM 125

Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 126

Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations

AGENDA ITEM 127

Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its seventeenth session

AGENDA ITEM 128

Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 129

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries

AGENDA ITEM 130

Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session

AGENDA ITEM 131

United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 132

Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country

AGENDA ITEM 133

Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization

AGENDA ITEM 134

Draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 135

Review of the multilateral treaty-making process

AGENDA ITEM 136

Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment

AGENDA ITEM 137

Draft standard rules of procedure for United Nations conferences: report of the Secretary-General

514. Mr. GÜNEY (Turkey), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee (*interpretation from French*): It is an honour for me to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Sixth Committee on agenda items 120 to 137, representing the outcome of the Committee's work during this session.

515. The report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 120 will be found in document A/39/770. In the draft resolution under this item, contained in paragraph 9 of the report, which was adopted by the Committee by 92 votes to none, with 16 abstentions, the Assembly expresses gratitude to the United Nations Institute for Training and Research for the completion of its analytical study on the progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order [*A/39/504/Add.1, annex III*] and urges Member States to submit not later than 30 June 1985 their views and comments with respect to that study.

516. In connection with agenda item 121, I draw the attention of the Assembly to the report of the Sixth Committee in document A/39/771 and to the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of that report. That draft resolution was adopted by the Committee by 92 votes to 10, with 17 abstentions. Among other things, States that have not done so, in particular those which are hosts to international organizations or to conferences, are urged in the draft resolution to consider the question of ratifying the Vienna Convention of the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character, and the States concerned are called on to accord to the delegations of the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States, and which are accorded observer status by international organizations, the facilities, privileges and immunities necessary for the performance of their functions. By the terms of the draft resolution, this question will come before the Assembly again in 1986.

517. That brings me to agenda item 122. The Sixth Committee's report on this item is contained in document A/39/772. The Committee adopted without a vote the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 thereof. By the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would again call on all States, as it did in resolutions 34/51 and 37/116, to consider at the earliest possible date the matter of ratifying the two Protocols Additional[2] to the Geneva Conventions of 1949; it would also decide to include this item in the agenda of its forty-first session.

518. In connection with agenda item 123, the Sixth Committee's report is contained in document A/39/773. The draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of the report was adopted by the Committee without a vote. By the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly—after reaffirming that good-neighbourliness fully conforms with the purposes of the United Nations and calling upon States, in the interest of the maintenance of international peace and security, to develop good-neighbourly relations—would decide to proceed with the task of identifying and clarifying the elements of good-

neighbourliness within the framework of a working group or other appropriate organ of the Sixth Committee as might be decided upon by the Committee when organizing its work at the fortieth session.

519. I now invite the members of the Assembly to consider document A/39/774, containing the Sixth Committee's report on agenda item 124. By the terms of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 10 of the report, which the Committee adopted without a vote, the Assembly would, *inter alia*, again urge all States to observe and promote in good faith the provisions of the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes,[6] request the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization to continue its work on the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes between States, and request the Secretary-General to prepare a draft handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes between States.

520. May I now ask the members of the Assembly to turn to document A/39/775, containing the Sixth Committee's report on agenda item 125. The draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of the report and recommended for adoption by the Assembly was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 96 to none, with 16 abstentions. By the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would request the International Law Commission to continue its work on the elaboration of the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind by elaborating an introduction as well as a list of the offences; and would request the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States and intergovernmental organizations regarding the conclusions contained in the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session [*see A/39/10, chap. II, para. 65*].

521. That brings me to the Sixth Committee's report on agenda item 126 [*A/39/776*]. By the terms of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 11 of the report, which the Sixth Committee adopted by a recorded vote of 80 to 16, with 11 abstentions, the Assembly would, *inter alia*, decide that the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations should continue its work at its session to be held in 1985 with the goal of drafting, at the earliest possible date, a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations as well as the peaceful settlement of disputes, or such other recommendations as the Special Committee might deem appropriate. As is indicated in paragraph 10 of the report, the Special Committee will hold its session from 28 January to 22 February 1985.

522. In connection with agenda item 127, the Sixth Committee's report is contained in document A/39/698. The draft resolution in paragraph 6 of the report, which the Committee adopted by consensus, contains a number of guidelines for the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and confirms its mandate.

523. I turn now to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 128 [*A/39/722*]. The Committee adopted without a vote the draft resolution contained in paragraph 7 of the report.

524. After having strongly condemned acts of violence against diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, as well as against missions and representatives to international intergovernmental organizations and officials of such organizations, the Assembly, in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, would urge States to observe and to implement the principles and rules of international law governing diplomatic and consular relations and, in particular, to take all necessary measures in conformity with their international obligations to ensure effectively the protection, security and safety of all diplomatic and consular missions and representatives officially present in territory under their jurisdiction, including practicable measures to prohibit in their territories illegal activities of persons, groups and organizations that encourage, instigate, organize or engage in the perpetration of acts against the security and safety of such missions and representatives.

525. By the same draft resolution, the Assembly, desiring to maintain and further strengthen the reporting procedures, would also request States to continue the procedures established by earlier resolutions.

526. The report of the Sixth Committee with regard to agenda item 129 is contained in document A/39/777. Paragraph 11 of the report contains the draft resolution adopted by consensus by the Sixth Committee. In the wording of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the Assembly would decide to renew the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries to enable it to continue its work on that projected convention. According to operative paragraph 8, the *Ad Hoc* Committee would hold its fifth session from 8 April to 3 May 1985.

527. I now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 130 [*A/39/778/Rev.1*], paragraph 6 of which contains the draft resolution which was adopted by the Committee by consensus. By the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would, *inter alia*, recommend that the International Law Commission should continue its work on all the topics in its current programme.

528. I now invite the Assembly to turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 131 [*A/39/779*]. The Committee adopted by consensus the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of the report. By the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, *inter alia*, note with appreciation that an invitation has been extended by the Government of Austria to hold the Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations at Vienna and would decide that the Conference shall be held there from 18 February to 21 March 1986. By the draft resolution, the Assembly would appeal to participants in the Conference to organize, prior to the convening of the Conference, consultations primarily on the organization and methods of work, and would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its fortieth session an item entitled "Preparation for the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations".

529. I now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 132 [*A/39/780*]. Paragraph 7 of the report contains a draft resolution which was adopted by consensus by the Committee, by which,

inter alia, the Assembly would strongly condemn any terrorist and criminal acts violating the security of missions accredited to the United Nations and the safety of their personnel and would request the Committee on Relations with the Host Country to continue its work.

530. The report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 133 is contained in document A/39/781, paragraph 12 of which contains draft resolutions A and B, which were adopted by the Committee without a vote. By the terms of draft resolution A, the Assembly would decide that the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization should hold its next session from 4 to 29 March 1985 and would define the tasks to be accomplished at that session; by draft resolution B, the conclusions of the Special Committee on the rationalization of the procedures of the General Assembly would be approved.

531. I turn now to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 134 [*A/39/782*]. By the terms of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of the report, which the Committee adopted without a vote, the Assembly would, *inter alia*, appeal to Member States representing different legal systems to undertake consultations on the draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally, with a view to finding out the extent to which they would join in the common endeavour of completing the work on the draft Declaration and would decide that this item would come before the Assembly again at its forty-first session.

532. In connection with the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 135 [*A/39/783*], I draw the Assembly's attention to paragraph 8 of the report, which contains the draft resolution recommended to the Assembly for adoption and which was adopted by the Committee by 111 votes to none, with 13 abstentions. Among other provisions, the Assembly would take note of the report of the Working Group on the Review of the Multilateral Treaty-Making Process, together with its final document thereon [*A/C.6/39/L.12, annex*], recommended to all States considering the initiation of a multilateral treaty within the framework of the United Nations to give consideration to the procedures set out in the final document.

533. In this connection, I draw the attention of the members of the Assembly to the fact that, as the report of the Working Group on the Review of the Multilateral Treaty-Making Process was reproduced in limited quantities, it will be reissued for general distribution as document A/C.6/39/8 and will become an integral part of the official records of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, so that it can remain easily and widely accessible in the years to come.

534. The report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 136 is contained in document A/39/784. The Committee adopted without a vote the draft decision contained in paragraph 9 of the report, aimed basically at extending the arrangements made at earlier sessions for the final preparation of the draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment.

535. The report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 137 is contained in document A/39/785. The Committee adopted by consensus the draft decision contained in paragraph 5 of the report and recommends it to the Assembly for adoption. The Assembly would thereby, *inter alia*, decide to defer to its fortieth session consideration of the reports of the Secretary-General on draft standard rules of procedure for United Nations conferences.

536. That concludes my introduction of the reports of the Sixth Committee on the agenda items allocated to it by the General Assembly. I apologize for having spoken at such length, but in view of the importance of the questions discussed this year, as in previous years, in the Committee, it seemed to me warranted to give them a fairly detailed presentation.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Sixth Committee.

537. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Sixth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

538. May I remind members that, in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the General Assembly decided that, when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once: that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in the plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. May I also remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

539. We turn now to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 120 [*A/39/770*]. Are there any explanations of vote before the voting? There being none, the General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 17 abstentions (resolution 39/75).

540. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 121 [*A/39/771*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Observer status of national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Burma, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 106 votes to 10, with 21 abstentions (resolution 39/76).

541. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 122 [*A/39/772*]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts", recommended in paragraph 8 of that report. That draft resolution was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/77).

542. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 123 [*A/39/773*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/78).

543. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 124 [*A/39/774*]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Peaceful settlement of disputes between States", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 10 of its report. That draft resolution was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/79).

544. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 125 [*A/39/775*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Burma, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 39/80).

545. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 126 [*A/39/776*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/39/734. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Ivory Coast, New Zealand, Paraguay, Sweden, Turkey.

The draft resolution was adopted by 111 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions (resolution 39/81).

546. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 127 [*A/39/698*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/82).

547. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 128 [*A/39/722*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/83).

548. The PRESIDENT: In the light of the particular decision which the Assembly has just taken, two delegations have asked to make statements, and I shall now call on them.

549. Mr. RAY (United States of America): The United States is pleased to participate in the consensus adoption of the resolution concerning the protection of diplomats which comes before us on the recommendation of the Legal Committee.

550. Terrorism is war against civilized society. For the terrorist, violence is politics, contrary to everything for which the United Nations stands. Nothing—I repeat, nothing—can justify terrorism. It is incumbent on the organized international community to leave no doubt that it does not tolerate terrorism.

551. During the past year, the United States has suffered the anguish of having its diplomats killed and its embassies attacked. Only last week, two American civilians—officials of the Agency for International Development—were brutally murdered aboard the hijacked Kuwaiti plane in Teheran. These American diplomats were singled out for murder. On 20 September of this year, the United States Embassy in Beirut was bombed. American and other lives were lost and scores of people were injured. Other United States diplomats and diplomatic establishments at Beirut and elsewhere have been attacked. Americans have been killed in Europe and in Africa. We feel these losses deeply, and also those of other nations.

552. These and other recent tragedies involving the loss of life of diplomats of various nationalities as well as international civil servants make it imperative that we not only mourn the terrible losses, but join together to prevent the recurrence of such tragic, outrageous murders. The least we could do tonight was to adopt the resolution before us by consensus and ensure that each and every Member State cooperate with one another and with the Secretary-General to combat such attacks.

553. All acts of terrorism are appalling. At the human and moral levels, attacks against diplomats are no more appalling than any other acts of terrorism against persons, but they may be more dangerous to peace. Diplomats and international civil servants are the means by which States communicate with each other. Serious differences between States will continue to exist, and attacks on diplomats strike at our principal means of resolving those differences.

554. The United States believes that the United Nations should take determined action against terrorism. We can think of no better place to start than with the protection of diplomats. All nations surely desire the protection of their officials.

555. In the past, the United Nations has adopted treaties and resolutions condemning and outlawing hijacking and other acts of terrorism against international civil aviation. The United Nations has also approved treaties and resolutions prohibiting the taking of hostages and outlawing attacks on diplomats. We have still not done enough, yet we can and we must honour these treaties in full.

556. The resolution we have adopted today by consensus should serve notice that the nations meeting here in organized session do not condone and will

not tolerate acts of violence against diplomats or against international civil servants. We hope all nations will implement the recommendations of this resolution. It is the very least we can do now to act against attacks on diplomats and international civil servants.

557. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): The fact that the Secretary-General has thought fit to issue an important statement on this item demonstrates both its intrinsic importance and its current relevance. My delegation warmly welcomes his statement.

558. Some of the shocking terrorist crimes of the last few months have been directed against my own country and its representatives. I am grateful for the messages of condolence which we have received from all sides. But I do not speak today in order to draw attention to any particular British problem. It is a problem which affects us all equally.

559. Since diplomacy began, it has been accepted that relations between States cannot be conducted unless their representatives can explain their Government's policies and defend their Government's interests without physical peril. Once the safety of government officials becomes hostage to the displeasure of other Governments—and still more so of dissident groups—at their Government's policies, it is the whole fabric of international diplomacy which tumbles to the ground. Since the founding of the United Nations, we have all accepted that the same principles apply to officials of the Organization.

560. In recent months, we have seen attacks against my own country, as I have said, but also against many others, against States of all kinds. No one is spared, neither Arab nor Israeli, neither Iranian nor Iraqi. The United Nations itself has been attacked, in the person of one of its senior officials. As soon as it becomes part of the currency of international life that vengeance may be taken on the persons of governmental or international officials, then none of us, without exception, will be safe from this contagion.

561. Perhaps none of this is new. Officials of the United Nations have been murdered before, even officials who have been singled out for no other reason than their involvement in peace-making and peace-keeping. We sometimes feel that the level of terrorist attacks is higher now than ever before, and that may be true. But the frequency of attacks must not be allowed to blunt our sense of outrage. However many or few the assaults on them, the principles remain the same. We here, in the meeting-place of the world, signal our determination to uphold them.

562. These are principles which all the Governments of the world are at one in accepting. That is because all of us will lose if acts of terrorism cause the international system to break down. Moreover, there is no difference on this point between Governments and peoples. Any individual or organization that commits a crime of the kind we are discussing weakens the fabric of international life to the detriment of everyone. The terrorists must be made to understand that the Governments of the world will not give in to threats or negotiate under duress.

563. It is for the Organization and for all the Governments represented here to make these truths clear and understood. My Government is proud to have taken a lead in encouraging co-operation between Governments to end the menace of terrorism. That is why we thought it right to make a statement on this item today rather than let it pass unremarked, as just another perennial Sixth Committee item that is simply nodded through.

564. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 129 [*A/39/777*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Drafting of an international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/39/817. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/84).

565. The PRESIDENT: Next we shall consider the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 130 [*A/39/778/Rev.1*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Report of the International Law Commission", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the Assembly also adopts it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/85).

566. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 131 [*A/39/779*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/86).

567. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 132 [*A/39/780*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/87).

568. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 133 [*A/39/781*]. I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolutions entitled "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the strengthening of the role of the Organization", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 12 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions is contained in document A/39/818. The Sixth Committee adopted draft resolutions A and B without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolutions A and B were adopted (resolutions 39/88 A and B).

569. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 134 [*A/39/782*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Draft Declaration on

Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also adopts that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/89).

570. The PRESIDENT: The next report of the Sixth Committee is on agenda item 135 [*A/39/783*]. I invite the Assembly to take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Review of the multilateral treaty-making process", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/90).[7]

571. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 136 [*A/39/784*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision entitled "Draft body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft decision without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/418).

572. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 137 [*A/39/785*] and take a decision on the draft decision entitled "Draft standard rules of procedure for United Nations conferences", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 5 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft decision by consensus. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/419).

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 972.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 1125, No. 17512.

[3] The delegation of Ethiopia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

[4] The delegation of Yemen subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on paragraph 15 of the draft resolution.

[5] See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1155, No. 18232, art. 18.

[6] Resolution 37/10, annex.

[7] The delegation of Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

100th PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 14 December 1984,
at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 18

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*):*

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly will first review its consideration of agenda item 18. In this connection the Assembly has before it various draft resolutions and recommendations contained in document A/39/L.17 and Corr.1, A/39/L.18 and chapter II of the report of the Special Committee [*A/39/23(Part I) and Corr.1*]. I call on the Chairman of the Special Committee, Mr. Abdul Koroma of Sierra Leone.

2. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone), Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Mr. President, I wish to thank you for calling me at this stage in connection with the Assembly's consideration of the three draft resolutions relating to agenda item 18.

3. In relation to the recommendation of the Special Committee set out in paragraph 10 of chapter II of its report, concerning the programme of activities in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration, reference is made to the ongoing consultations by the Chairman. The purpose of my intervention at this time is to inform the Assembly that, with respect to the preparation of a compendium on the subject of decolonization referred to in subparagraph (*n*) of that paragraph, it has been agreed upon by members of the Special Committee that this recommendation need not be acted upon by the Assembly.

4. I may add in this regard that the majority of the members of the Special Committee are convinced of the usefulness of such a study and that it may be undertaken at a later date, as appropriate, in another context. I should like to place on record the appreciation of members of the Special Committee for the constructive initiative taken by the delegation of Venezuela.

5. I wish once again to emphasize the importance which the Committee attaches to the programme of activities in observance of this historic anniversary, more so in terms of the need to facilitate the speedy implementation of the Declaration with respect to those territories whose people have yet to exercise their right to self-determination and independence than for purely commemorative purposes stressing past achievements.

6. I wish to reiterate my sincere hope that these draft resolutions will receive the broadest possible support from the members in this forum.

7. The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to draft resolutions A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and L.18 as well as the recommendations contained in paragraphs 9 and 10 of chapter II of the report of the Special Committee. I call now on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on those draft resolutions.

8. Mr. STEFANINI (Italy): Italy is well aware that although decolonization has been a major achievement of the Organization, there are still peoples who need to be freed from the yoke of colonialism, namely, in Namibia. We believe that the Special Committee has been and still is instrumental in carrying out the Declaration on decolonization. To this end, obviously, the task of promoting and disseminating information, which has been entrusted to the Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance, has always received specific acknowledgement from this Assembly.

9. We would have liked to maintain our support for the draft resolution on the dissemination of information on decolonization. As such, the text contained in document A/39/L.18 would have been perfectly acceptable if it did not imply the approval of a part of the report of the Special Committee on which we have the strongest reservations. I refer to chapter III.

10. We disagree on some elements of the report, especially in that they contain unjustified criticism of member countries or groups of countries and references to questions which are not included in the mandate of the Special Committee. In our view it would be quite inappropriate, to say the least, to ask the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat to carry out unfriendly activities towards States Members of the United Nations.

11. Therefore, Italy will abstain from voting on draft resolution A/39/L.18 on the dissemination of information on decolonization.

12. Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): The Assembly is aware from my delegation's statement on decolonization on 5 December that we have serious reserva-

---

*Resumed from the 87th meeting.

tions about the three draft resolutions before us today.

13. We note that the rhetoric in draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 on the implementation of the Declaration is identical with last year's [resolution 38/54] and that it is primarily concerned with *apartheid* and Namibia. We have made it clear in the Assembly exactly where we stand on those two problems. But the draft resolution, sadly, says nothing about the true situation in the remaining British dependent Territories, which make up about half the agenda of the Special Committee. Moreover, much of the language is carping, ungenerous and irrelevant. Our primary responsibility is to the Governments and the peoples of our dependent Territories. Given the scant account which this draft resolution takes of their aspirations and interests, we are compelled once again to vote against.

14. With regard to draft resolution A/39/L.18, on dissemination of information on decolonization, we of course support publicity to promote awareness of the rights of all peoples to self-determination. But much of the information work on decolonization done by the United Nations is contentious, undesirable and unnecessary. Moreover, information work on decolonization should obviously decrease as colonialism itself diminishes. But this draft resolution argues that it should be intensified. When the United Nations is faced with so many more pressing tasks, how can that be justified?

15. Is the Assembly aware, for example, that the report of the Special Committee contains a proposal to hold yet another seminar next year on dissemination of information on decolonization with non-governmental organizations? Is it aware that a separate seminar on the same subject is recommended, this time with the participation of the news media? Is it familiar with the proposals for studies on the importance of decolonization for the promotion of world peace, on military bases and activities in colonial Territories, and even on issues outside the General Assembly's competence? These are just some of the spendthrift and politically dubious proposals contained in the report of the Special Committee.

16. But is it necessary to have a separate draft resolution on dissemination of information on decolonization at all? After all, there exists perfectly adequate machinery for dealing with information questions in the United Nations. Does it, then, make sense to decentralize the handling of information questions according to subject-matter and thereby to encourage the proliferation of information resolutions? In the interests of the efficient management of the Organization, the answer must be "No".

17. For all these reasons, we must, regretfully, vote against draft resolution A/39/L.18.

18. The third draft resolution before us today concerns the celebrations to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on decolonization. The process of decolonization is an important event, and we have no quarrel with that. But is the General Assembly aware of the extremely lavish activities that the draft resolution proposes? Would we not better match our sense of priorities and a genuine concern for people by, for example, contributing to famine relief in Africa? If this is not thought to be acceptable, surely it would be better in the eyes of the world to spend money not on ourselves but on the colonial peoples for whom the Special Committee is supposed to be showing concern. In the light of all those considerations, we are compelled to vote against the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of chapter II of the report of the Special Committee.

19. Mrs. KUROKOCHI (Japan): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and L.18 because we firmly support the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and hope that it will be duly implemented. My delegation commends the sponsors of the draft resolutions for their efforts in trying to avoid the insertion of various unnecessary and controversial elements that have often appeared in resolutions relating to decolonization.

20. At the same time, however, I must, with regret, express my delegation's reservations on certain provisions contained in these documents. My delegation cannot support some parts of the report of the Special Committee, which paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/39/L.18 approve, and therefore wishes to indicate its reservations.

21. For reasons we have made clear on a number of occasions, including meetings at this session, my delegation has reservations on other paragraphs in draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1, particularly paragraphs 4, 6, and 10. Moreover, it is my delegation's understanding that paragraph 7 is intended not as a condemnation of all foreign economic activities, but rather of a particular type of them, which in fact impedes the process of self-determination in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

22. My delegation will also vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of chapter II of the report of the Special Committee, on the programme of activities in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in the same spirit as that in which we support the two draft resolutions I have just mentioned. However, my delegation cannot support some of the activities for commemoration mentioned in the annex to the draft resolution. In particular, the subsidiary organs of the General Assembly should observe the directives set out by the General Assembly, including resolution 31/140, which states that United Nations bodies may hold sessions away from their headquarters only when host Governments agree to pay the additional costs directly or indirectly involved.

23. Mr. LUNDVIK (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. The Nordic countries' abiding commitment to the process of decolonization is well known. That process has, with the exception of Namibia, very nearly run its course. It is one of the historic achievements of this Organization. The Nordic countries will vote in favour of the three draft resolutions before us. We regret, however, that we cannot do so without reservations.

24. Draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 contains formulations to which we cannot give our consent. For example, paragraph 4 contains formulations that are contrary to the principle upheld by the Nordic countries, that, in conformity with its Charter, the United Nations should always encourage only peaceful solutions. Furthermore, we find paragraph 10 too categorically formulated.

25. Our vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/39/L.18 regarding the chapter of the report of the Special Committee relating to the dissemination of information should not be interpreted as an approval of all specific parts of that chapter. In particular, we disapprove of paragraph 20 (6), regarding a study by the Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization on a Territory not on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories approved by the General Assembly.

26. Finally, we have reservations with regard to the substantial additional expenditures that the proposed large meetings away from headquarters involve. The Nordic countries support the general principle embodied in General Assembly resolution 31/140 that United Nations bodies shall meet at their established headquarters.

27. Mr. ROWE (Australia): One of the most important contributions made by the United Nations has been in the field of decolonization, and Australia is proud to have played its part. The year 1984 has been a particularly memorable one for Australia because, with the attainment of self-determination by the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Australia's role as an administering Power came to an end.

28. The United Nations success in decolonization has meant that the General Assembly and the Special Committee have been faced in recent years with a dwindling list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, with Namibia as the most difficult and the most intractable problem on the decolonization agenda. The Australian Government fully supports the goal of independence for the people of Namibia and calls upon South Africa to cease its illegal occupation of the Territory and to co-operate in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of that Territory. With the exception of Namibia, the process of decolonization is being worked out in a peaceful and measured manner in the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories in accordance with the wishes of the peoples of those Territories.

29. Turning to the draft resolutions before us, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and L.18 and of the draft resolution concerning the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration. We shall do so in spite of the fact that we have a number of objections to elements contained therein. My delegation remains firmly of the view that this Organization ought to seek to resolve international disputes by peaceful means, and we cannot accept endorsement of armed struggle, as is affirmed in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1. Nor can we accept that the existence of Non-Self-Governing Territories poses a serious threat to international peace and security, as is affirmed in paragraph 2.

30. Turning to draft resolution A/39/L.18 on the dissemination of information, I should emphasize that my delegation accepts that the United Nations has a role to play in keeping the international community informed of progress in the decolonization area. We are opposed, however, to certain of the proposals for action in this field contained in the reports of the Special Committee, particularly those relating to Territories which are not on the Assembly's list of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

31. With relation to the programme of activities in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the letter sent by the representative of Australia to the Chairman of the Special Committee on 10 September 1984, which is annexed to chapter II of the report of the Special Committee. As I said in my opening remarks, we believe that the bulk of the work on the decolonization agenda has now been concluded and that, in reaching this twenty-fifth anniversary, we should rightly rejoice at our successes. We do not believe, however, that it is appropriate to embark upon an ambitious programme, as proposed by the Special Committee.

32. As we outlined in our letter, we believe that in looking to the future it seems desirable to consider how the United Nations might arrive at viable permanent solutions for the remaining small Territories, rather than seek to develop ambitious plans for the continuation of the Special Committee's work along existing paths.

33. Accordingly, my delegation is opposed to the proposed holding of a series of meetings and seminars away from Headquarters in 1985 in celebration of this anniversary, and we voted against the financial implications of these proposals in the Fifth Committee.

34. Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): As is well known, the Canadian delegation has supported and will continue to support the decolonization process. We shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.18 on the dissemination of information. That said, we have serious reservations about some of the recommendations contained in the associated report of the Special Committee. We do not believe that the Special Committee should involve itself in matters which are beyond its jurisdiction, either because those issues are essentially domestic or because they are matters for other United Nations bodies. Palau, as a strategic Trust Territory, falls into the latter category.

35. Canada cannot subscribe to the notion contained in the report of the Special Committee of placing restrictions on freedom of the press, specifically on foreign correspondents based in South Africa. Indeed, that sort of recommendation clearly contradicts the thrust of the draft resolution. Reports from such correspondents inform readers of the Western media of the evils of the *apartheid* system, not to mention progress in other African countries that they visit from time to time. The Canadian delegation notes that the Special Committee's report refers to some sort of hostile campaign by some Western countries and the mass media to depict national liberation movements as terrorist organizations. No such campaign exists, nor is there any sort of link between Governments of Western countries and the mass media. Indeed, the media are free to report on events as they see fit.

36. My delegation will abstain in the votes on draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and on that concerning the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations, contained in chapter II of the Special Committee's report. We have serious reservations about the financial implications.

37. In the case of draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1, furthermore, we cannot accept the implicit support for armed struggle or the unconditional call for the withdrawal of military bases from colonial Territories.

38. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote in favour of draft

resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1, since Turkey strongly supports the efforts of the international community in the struggle against colonialism. However, we have reservations about paragraph 10 of the draft resolution. We consider that it is not worded in a sufficiently balanced way.

39. Mr. KURPERSHOEK (Netherlands): The importance of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly in 1960 as resolution 1514 (XV), is well-established. We are daily reminded of it as we walk through the gates of the United Nations and look up at the 159 fluttering flags, displaying the national colours of the Members of the Organization. The world in general, as reflected in the membership of the United Nations, has undergone a radical transformation as a result of the decolonization process, to which resolution 1514 (XV) made a significant contribution.

40. Today, that process has, by and large, been completed, and the few remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories maintain their ties with the administering Powers in accordance with the democratically expressed wishes of their inhabitants.

41. The Netherlands remains committed to the full implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) and will continue its efforts to further international economic co-operation and to promote social, economic and educational development in accordance with its provisions.

42. This year we have had the pleasure of welcoming the accession to independence of Brunei Darussalam and its admission as the 159th Member of the United Nations.

43. The one major exception to the successful implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) remains, of course, Namibia. Ending South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia rightly remains one of the central objectives of the United Nations. The Netherlands Government will continue to support all efforts aimed at enabling the people of Namibia to exercise, at the earliest possible date, their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

44. Because of the importance my country attaches to the principles laid down in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1. There are certain elements in draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1, however, which we cannot support. In particular, we have reservations concerning paragraphs 2, 4, 7, 8 and 10.

45. My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.18 on the dissemination of information on decolonization. Among other things, the Netherlands objects to a number of elements in the report of the Special Committee, which the draft resolution would approve. Against the background of the existing broad consensus regarding the issue of decolonization, my delegation regrets that some of the recommendations in that report seek to divert the Special Committee from its proper task and to make the true interests of the peoples of the dependent Territories subservient to a campaign of defamation against one particular group of countries.

46. My delegation will also abstain in the vote on the Programme of Activities in Observance of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Declaration on decolonization. In our view, the resources for the observance of that anniversary must be found within the regular budget of the Organization. For this occasion to be celebrated in a fitting manner there is no need for activities on the lavish scale envisaged in this programme. Moreover, there are some elements in the programme to which my Government cannot agree.

47. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the voting, I wish to announce that five countries have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1, and four countries have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/39/L.18. The Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on the draft resolutions and recommendations contained in documents A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and L.18 and in chapter II of document A/39/23 (Part I) and Corr.1. The programme budget implications of those draft resolutions are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/825*].

48. The Assembly will vote first on draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg.

The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions (resolution 39/91).

49. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/39/L.18. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

The draft resolution was adopted by 139 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions (resolution 39/92).

50. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of chapter II of the report of the Special Committee [*A/39/23 (Part I) and Corr.1*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

The draft resolution was adopted by 137 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/93).

51. The PRESIDENT: I should now like to draw the attention of members to the recommendations contained in paragraph 10 of chapter II of document A/39/23 (Part I) and Corr.1. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly adopts those recommendations of the Special Committee, bearing in mind the statement made by the Chairman of the Special Committee this morning [*see para. 3 above*].

It was so decided (decision 39/420).

52. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

53. Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria considers that the process of decolonization constitutes one of the outstanding achievements of the United Nations. Austria has consistently supported the efforts of the United Nations in this regard.

54. In view of our sincere commitment to the process of decolonization and to the right of peoples to self-determination, Austria has supported all draft resolutions submitted under this item. However, we have reservations with regard to some of the provisions contained in these texts. In particular, I wish to refer to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and to emphasize that we understand that paragraph as referring exclusively to struggle by peaceful means, as befits an Organization which is built on the principles of the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

55. Ms. O'FARRELL (Ireland): Ireland has, whenever possible, supported draft resolutions under this item in order to reaffirm our support for the process of peaceful decolonization based upon resolution 1514 (XV) and for the work of the United Nations generally in the decolonization field. In this spirit my delegation has voted in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.17 and Corr.1 and L.18. We also voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of chapter II of the report of the Special Committee and relating to the Programme of Activities in Observance of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

56. My delegation, however, has reservations on some of the generalizations in draft resolution A/39/L.17 and Corr.1, and, with regard to paragraph 10 of that draft resolution, I should like to reaffirm that in determining our attitude towards specific military bases and installations my delegation will be guided by the attitudes, freely expressed, of the inhabitants of the Territories in question.

57. In addition, while we support in general the work of the Special Committee, we have reservations

in relation to some of its recommendations and decisions.

AGENDA ITEM 70

Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

AGENDA ITEM 71

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories: reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 72

International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

(*b*) Implementation of the recommendations of the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 73

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

AGENDA ITEM 74

Questions relating to information:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on Information;

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

AGENDA ITEM 75

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East:

(*a*) Report of the Commissioner-General;

(*b*) Report of the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;

(*c*) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine;

(*d*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 76

International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 77

Israel's decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 78

Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India

AGENDA ITEM 79

Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations

58. Mr. CHEN CHARPENTIER (Mexico), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration this morning 10 reports of the Special Political Committee.

59. The first report [*A/39/609*] relates to agenda item 70. The Special Political Committee considered this item at two meetings, and after hearing 18 statements in the general debate adopted a draft resolution without a vote. The draft resolution, which appears in paragraph 8 of the report, is recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

60. The second report [*A/39/712*] relates to agenda item 71. Ten meetings of the Special Political Committee were devoted to this item and 47 delegations took part in the discussion. Eight draft resolutions, all of which were adopted by recorded votes, appear in paragraph 26 of the report and are recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

61. The third report [*A/39/713*], relates to agenda item 72. The Special Political Committee devoted nine meetings to consideration of this item, between 2 November and 1 December, and, after hearing 48 speakers in the general debate, adopted by consensus the draft resolution which appears in paragraph 10 of the report. I commend that draft resolution to the General Assembly for adoption.

62. With regard to agenda item 73, the Committee considered this item at four meetings and heard 29 statements in the general debate. The draft resolution, which was adopted without a vote, appears in paragraph 6 of the report [*A/39/610*] and is recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

63. Turning to agenda item 74, twelve meetings were devoted to consideration of this item and 76 speakers participated in the general debate. The two draft resolutions, both of which were adopted by recorded votes, appear in paragraph 15 of the report and are recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

64. The next report [*A/39/715*] relates to item 75 of the agenda. The Special Political Committee considered this item at 10 meetings and heard 42 statements in the general debate. Eleven draft resolutions, which appear in paragraph 35 of the report, are recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. Two of the draft resolutions were adopted without a vote and the rest by recorded votes.

65. Four meetings of the Special Political Committee were devoted to agenda item 76 and 24 delegations took part in the debate. The draft resolution, which was adopted without a vote, appears in paragraph 12 of the report [*A/39/621*] and is recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

66. The next report [*A/39/716*] relates to agenda item 77. The Committee considered this item at four meetings and heard 17 statements in the general debate. The draft resolution, which was adopted by a recorded vote, appears in paragraph 9 of the report and is recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

67. With regard to agenda item 78, and for the reasons set out in paragraph 3 of the report of the Committee [*A/39/717/Rev.1*], the Special Political Committee recommends that the General Assembly include the item in the provisional agenda of its fortieth session.

68. Lastly, I present the Committee's report on agenda item 79 [*A/39/670*]. For the reasons set out in paragraph 3 of the report, the Special Political Committee recommends that the General Assembly include this item in the provisional agenda of its fortieth session.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Special Political Committee.

69. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Special Political Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

70. May I remind members that in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401 the General Assembly decided as follows: "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

71. We shall consider first the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 70 [*A/39/609*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/94).

72. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 71 [*A/39/712*].

73. There are no representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting. The Assembly will therefore now vote upon draft resolutions A to H, one by one. After all the votes have been taken, representatives will again be given an opportunity to explain their votes.

74. The Assembly will now take a decision on the eight draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 26 of its report [*A/39/712*]. I invite members to turn their attention to draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, Zaire.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions (resolution 39/95 A).[1]

75. The PRESIDENT: Next, I shall put to the vote draft resolution B. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 1 of draft resolution B. If there is no objection, I shall put it to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: None.

Paragraph 1 of draft resolution B was adopted by 143 votes to 1.[2]

76. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Liberia, United States of America, Zaire.

Draft resolution B, as a whole, was adopted by 140 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions (resolution 39/95 B).[1]

77. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to draft resolution C. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: United States of America.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 143 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/95 C).[3]

78. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to draft resolution D. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 6 of that draft resolution. If there is no objection, I shall put it to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Paragraph 6 of draft resolution D was adopted by 99 votes to 18, with 25 abstentions.[4]

79. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution D as a whole. The programme budget implications of that draft resolution are to be found in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/769*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica,[5] Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

Draft resolution D, as a whole, was adopted by 115 votes to 2, with 28 abstentions (resolution 39/95 D).[1]

80. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote draft resolution E. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: United States of America.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 143 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/95 E).[6]

81. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution F. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of

Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Liberia, United States of America, Zaire.

Draft resolution F was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions (resolution 39/95 F).[1]

82. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote draft resolution G. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 117 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions (resolution 39/95 G).[1]

83. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote draft resolution H. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution H was adopted by 143 votes to 2 (resolution 39/95 H).[1]

84. The PRESIDENT: I invite members to turn their attention to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 72 [*A/39/713*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 10 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/96).

85. The PRESIDENT: We shall next consider the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 73 [*A/39/610*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/97).

86. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 74 [*A/39/714*]. The Assembly will now take decisions on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 15 of its report. We turn first to draft resolution A. The programme budget implications of that draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/826*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Luxembourg, New Zealand.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 132 votes to 6, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/98 A).[1]

87. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 122 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions (resolution 39/98 B).

88. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Australia for an explanation of vote.

89. Mr. FARMER (Australia): In explaining Australia's votes on the draft resolutions adopted under agenda item 74, I begin by expressing regret that it was not in the event possible to achieve consensus on either of the resolutions. It had seemed to us that in the light of the views of the very great majority of delegations, such an outcome should and could have been achievable. Certainly, the Australian delegation is grateful to other delegations for the positive spirit which was brought to bear in resolving differences on a number of delicate issues. We particularly appreciate the efforts which resulted in the reformulation of paragraph 9 of resolution A in a constructive and helpful way.

90. Having regard to progress which was made on such issues, it is, in our view, the more unfortunate that consensus was not able to be achieved on other issues. At the end of the process of consultations, the Australian delegation continued to have difficulty with the references in paragraphs 4 and 10 of resolution A, while on resolution B, we regretted the absence of a reference, however oblique, to resolution 3/1 adopted by UNESCO in 1983. Australia's abstention in the votes on the draft resolutions was based on these considerations. We would hope that next year's consideration of this item might be crowned by the adoption of consensus texts.

91. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 75 [*A/39/715*].

92. I call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to revise one of the draft resolutions contained in paragraph 35 of the report.

93. Mr. EZDI (Pakistan): My delegation would like to introduce an oral revision to resolution I recommended by the Committee in paragraph 35 of its report.

94. This draft resolution, entitled "Protection of Palestine refugees", was introduced in the Committee by my delegation and was adopted by the Committee at its 29th meeting on 12 November.

95. The revision is being introduced on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution. Under this proposal, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would be amended to read as follows:

> "Holds Israel responsible for the security of the Palestine refugees in occupied southern Lebanon, and calls upon it to fulfil its obligations as the occupying Power in this regard, in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949;".

96. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

97. Mr. BARROMI (Israel): The common element in the 11 draft resolutions before us is the continued acquiescence with the fundamentally unhealthy situation that is the artificial perpetuation of the refugee problem. Some draft resolutions are of an aggressive, partisan, anti-Israel character. The overall effect of these texts, if adopted, will be another growing refugee population, an ever-expanding bureaucracy and the rising curve of expenses to be funded by the international community. The United Nations will share for another year in the solution-oriented action afoot.

98. Another feature of the texts which are brought to this plenary meeting is the lack of balance, fairness and historical accuracy. The draft resolutions contain many outrageous and unwarranted allegations against my country. On the other hand, the responsibility of the Arab States for the creation of the refugee problem and for the present plight of many refugees is nowhere mentioned. There is no reference to the central fact that the Arab States ignited the flames of war in 1948 and encouraged the flight of the Palestinian Arabs from the fledgling State of Israel, which was then struggling for its very existence.

99. Draft resolution A notes with deep regret the non-implementation of paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. But no regret is manifested anywhere for the Arab rejection of all offers of negotiation and of all attempts to implement United Nations constructive projects. In the 11 texts before us, Israel is repeatedly censured or condemned. There is no condemnation, however, of the Arab States. Their role in the transformation of refugee camps into terrorist bases, or in the naked power struggle which is going on in the camps between rival terrorist outfits, is simply ignored. Even the shelling a year ago of refugee camps by an Arab army is not considered worthy of recalling.

100. Some draft resolutions are of an obvious cantankerous nature. Let us take, for example, draft resolution K, which calls for a university in Jerusalem for Palestinian Arab refugees. To set up a university for refugees is an absurdity in educational terms. Furthermore, the demand that a new university be established in an area remarkable for its many institutions of higher learning shows a reckless disregard of sound administration and of any restraint in the use of international funding. This grotesque proposal can be explained only as a move in an overall strategy directed to institutionalize the refugee problem through the proliferation of new bodies and of new channels for pumping in international money.

101. Another draft resolution which defies logic is draft resolution J, which calls upon Israel to abandon its plans aimed at bettering the housing conditions of the refugees. In the jaundiced view of the authors of the draft resolution the voluntary moving of refugees to new, healthy and permanent lodgings is inadmissible. Paragraph 1 demands that the refugees remain in their camps presumably for ever. No comment is required.

102. Draft resolution H calls on the Secretary-General to take steps for the administration of refugee property in Israel. This text runs counter to the basic tenets of international law. Property rights and property regulations within the borders of a sovereign State are exclusively subject to domestic law and United Nations interference with that is unthinkable. What is at stake here is the principle of the sovereign equality of States, on which the whole structure of the United Nations rests. Draft resolution H is a juridical operation that should find no place in the United Nations records.

103. The most obvious example of politicization of the refugee item is draft resolution I, entitled "Protection of Palestine refugees". The draft resolution holds Israel responsible for the situation in southern Lebanon. The sixth preambular paragraph refers to "kidnapping, disappearances, evictions in the face of threats, explosions and arsons". It is well known, however, that these outrages do not occur in southern Lebanon. They occur every day in the parts of Lebanon which are not under Israeli control. It is equally known that a growing number of displaced persons stream from the north to the south to the Israeli-held areas, where order and tranquillity prevail. The text denounces Israel's occupation and ignores the root of all present Lebanese evils, that is, Syrian occupation and Syria's interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon. Syrian interference certainly plays a role these days in hindering an agreement for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory.

104. Draft resolution I is not a humanitarian document. It is an instrument of political warfare and as such it deserves outright rejection.

105. My delegation will vote against draft resolutions E, F, G, H, I, J and K and will abstain on draft resolutions A and D.

106. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 35 of its report [*A/39/715*]. I now put to the vote draft resolution A entitled "Assistance to Palestine refugees". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 145 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/99 A).[1]

107. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Working Group on the Financing of the United

Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East". The programme budget implications of that draft resolution appear in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/802/Rev.1*]. The Special Political Committee adopted draft resolution B without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 39/99 B).

108. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C, entitled "Assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities", was also adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 39/99 C).

109. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution D, entitled "Offers by Member States of grants and scholarships for higher education, including vocational training, for the Palestine refugees". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 145 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/99 D).[1]

110. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E is entitled "Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 145 votes to 2 (resolution 39/99 E).[1]

111. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Resumption of the ration distribution to Palestine refugees". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Portugal, Spain, Zaire.

Draft resolution F was adopted by 122 votes to 19, with 4 abstentions (resolution 39/99 F).[1]

112. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution G, entitled "Population and refugees displaced since 1967". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions (resolution 39/99 G).[1]

113. The PRESIDENT: We come next to draft resolution H, entitled "Revenues derived from Palestine refugee properties". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

Draft resolution H was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions (resolution 39/99 H).[1]

114. The PRESIDENT: Before I put draft resolution I to the vote, I remind representatives that, as the representative of Pakistan announced earlier [*see para. 95*], paragraph 2 has been revised by the sponsors. We shall now vote on draft resolution I, entitled "Protection of Palestine refugees", as orally revised by the representative of Pakistan. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

Draft resolution I, as orally revised, was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 18 abstentions (resolution 39/99 I).[1]

115. The **PRESIDENT**: We shall now vote on draft resolution J, entitled "Palestine refugees in the West Bank". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution J was adopted by 145 votes to 2 (resolution 39/99 J).[1]

116. The **PRESIDENT**: Finally, we come to draft resolution K, which is entitled "University of Jerusalem 'Al-Quds' for Palestine refugees". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/802/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution K was adopted by 144 votes to 2 (resolution 39/99 K).[7]

117. The **PRESIDENT**: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

118. Mr. **FARTAS** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation supported the draft resolutions on Israeli practices in occupied Arab territories as well as the draft resolution on the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. Nevertheless, we should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm our firm position on the substance of the Palestinian question and therefore to express reservations about anything in the draft resolutions that might signify that my country would be prepared to recognize the Zionist entity or to confer legitimacy on it.

119. Mr. **NIARE** (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation is pleased to confirm its support for the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. Consequently, I should like to announce that it had intended to sponsor the draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 to L.17 on agenda item 75.

120. The **PRESIDENT**: I now invite members of the Assembly to turn their attention to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 76 [*A/39/621*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 12 of that report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of this draft resolution is in document A/39/664. The Special Political Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/100).

121. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 77 [*A/39/716*].

122. I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to explain his delegation's vote before the voting.

123. Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of the Committee's report. The proposed canal, part of which will be built in the Gaza Strip, which is a Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, is a violation of norms and principles of international law, in particular of principles relating to the fundamental rights and duties of States in respect of the occupation of territory by force. This affects the rights of the Palestinian people and the inalienable national rights of peoples regarding all parts of their territory.

124. The Israeli canal would also have very dangerous consequences, irreparably compromising the rights of the Kingdom of Jordan, and affecting various aspects of the vital interests of that country.

125. In the light of what I have said, the Syrian Arab Republic would have wished to become a sponsor of this draft resolution.

126. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution recommended in paragraph 9 of the Committee's report [*A/39/716*]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution appears in document A/39/788. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 143 votes to 2, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/101).[7]

127. The PRESIDENT: I shall call now on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

128. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes to express the same reservations it has expressed with respect to other draft resolutions.

129. Mr. HASSAN (Djibouti): My delegation would have liked to add its name to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution just adopted by the General Assembly.

130. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 78 [*A/39/717/Rev.1*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee contained in paragraph 4 of its report. The Committee recommends that the General Assembly should include in the provisional agenda of its fortieth session the item entitled "Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India". If I hear no objection, I shall consider that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation.

The recommendation was adopted (decision 39/421).

131. The PRESIDENT: We turn finally to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 79 [*A/39/670*]. In paragraph 5 of that report the Committee recommends that the General Assembly should include in the provisional agenda of its fortieth session the item entitled "Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations". In the absence of any objection, may I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

The recommendation was adopted (decision 39/422).

132. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Special Political Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

NOTES

[1] The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[2] The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 1 of draft resolution B.

[3] The delegations of Cape Verde and the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[4] The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 6 of draft resolution D.

[5] The delegation of Costa Rica subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended not to participate in the vote.

[6] The delegations of Colombia and the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[7] The delegations of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Mali subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

101st

PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 14 December 1984,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Economic and Social Council (chaps. I, II, III (part I, sects. A to C and E, and part II, sect. D), IV (sect. A), V (sects. A, B and D), VII, VIII and IX (part I, sect. H));

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

AGENDA ITEM 92

International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 93

United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace:

(*a*) Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women;

(*c*) Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 94

Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women:

(*a*) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women;

(*b*) Status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 95

Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance

AGENDA ITEM 96

Human rights and scientific and technological developments

AGENDA ITEM 97

Question of a convention on the rights of the child

AGENDA ITEM 98

International Covenants on Human Rights:

(*a*) Report of the Human Rights Committee;

(*b*) Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Elaboration of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty

AGENDA ITEM 100

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees:

(*a*) Report of the High Commissioner;

(*b*) Assistance to refugees in Africa: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 101

International campaign against traffic in drugs: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 102

Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms:

(*a*) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/124;

(*b*) National institutions for the protection and promotion of human rights: report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. POLOWCZYK (Poland), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: I have the honour and privilege to introduce the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 12, 92 to 98 and 100 to 102.

2. In paragraph 69 of its report on agenda item 12 [*A/39/700*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of 20 draft resolutions. Draft resolutions I to XVII were adopted by the Committee without a vote. Draft resolution XVIII was adopted by a recorded vote of 83 to 13, with 35 abstentions. Draft resolution XIX was adopted by a recorded vote of 79 to 13, with 39 abstentions. Draft resolution XX was adopted by a recorded vote of 83 to 15, with 32 abstentions.

3. In paragraph 8 of its report on agenda item 92 [*A/39/701*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution that was adopted by the Committee without a vote.

4. In paragraph 22 of its report on agenda item 93 [*A/39/702*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of seven draft resolutions. Draft resolutions I to IV, VI and VII were adopted by the Committee without a vote. Draft resolution V was adopted by a recorded vote of 124 to 1, with 10 abstentions.

5. In paragraph 8 of its report on agenda item 94 [*A/39/703*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution that it adopted by a recorded vote of 124 to 1, with 4 abstentions.

6. In paragraph 13 of its report on agenda item 102 [*A/38/711*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions. Draft resolution I was adopted by the Committee without a vote. Draft resolution II was adopted by a recorded vote of 118 to 1, with 13 abstentions.

7. In paragraph 12 of its report on agenda item 100 [*A/39/709*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions which it adopted without a vote.

8. In paragraph 16 of its report on agenda item 101 [*A/39/710*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of three draft resolutions which it adopted without a vote.

9. In paragraph 7 of its report on agenda item 95 [*A/39/704*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution that it adopted without a vote.

10. In paragraph 11 of its report on agenda item 96 [*A/39/705*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of three draft resolutions. Draft resolution I was adopted by the Committee without a vote. Draft resolution II was adopted by a recorded vote of 100 to none, with 20 abstentions. Draft resolution III was adopted by a recorded vote of 97 to 6, with 17 abstentions.

11. In paragraph 7 of its report on agenda item 97 [*A/39/706*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution that it adopted without a vote.

12. In paragraph 15 of its report on agenda item 98 [*A/39/707*], the Third Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of three draft resolutions. Draft resolutions I and III were adopted by the Committee without a vote. Draft resolution II was adopted by a recorded vote of 57 to 18, with 50 abstentions.

13. I submit the recommendations of the Third Committee to the General Assembly for adoption.

14. In concluding, I should like to express my warm and sincere gratitude to the Secretariat, in particular to Mrs. Pilar Santander-Downing and Mr. Valeri Yudin for their diligent work and the assistance extended to me.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee.

15. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Third Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

16. I remind members that, in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the General Assembly decided that, when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. I also remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

17. The Assembly will consider first the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 12 [*A/39/700*].

18. I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote. I shall then put the recommendations of the Third Committee to the Assembly one by one, without interruption.

19. Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines): My delegation would like to explain its votes on draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.43/Rev.2, "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador", draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.77, "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala", and draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.79, "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile".

20. In the past, the Philippines has voted against resolutions on the human rights situation in Chile, El Salvador and Guatemala. However, in view of the changing circumstances as they affect the situation in those three countries and elsewhere, the Philippines will abstain in the vote on the relevant resolutions this year. I should like to add that our abstention still reflects our main concern relating to the principle of

non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States as stipulated in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations. We feel that unless adequate safeguards are instituted to preserve and protect this principle, the appointment of a special rapporteur or representative to look into the human rights situation in any Member State might infringe on that principle.

21. Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the debate on agenda item 12 in the Third Committee, my delegation explicitly stated the policy of the democratic Government of Bolivia in defence of the total validity of human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world and, furthermore, expressed its concern at and energetic condemnation of the violation of human rights wherever they are vulnerable.

22. The delegation of Bolivia once again repeats the desire of the Government and the people of Bolivia to see respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms restored in Chile, Guatemala and El Salvador. On this occasion we should like to refer to the report of the Third Committee contained in document A/39/700, in particular draft resolutions XVIII, XIX and XX relating to the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador, Guatemala and Chile, respectively. As last year, for political reasons my delegation will not participate in the voting on those three draft resolutions and requests that this position be duly recorded in the proceedings of this meeting.

23. Mr. DAZA (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile wishes to say that it will vote against the draft resolution on human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile. In the Third Committee we explicitly stated that the legal rules of the Organization impose an overwhelming obligation to concern itself with promoting the development and encouragement of human rights in the world, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, on the basis of objective, universal and non-political criteria. That same set of rules prohibits discrimination and selectivity.

24. I do not want to repeat here the flagrant violations of human rights—which I described in the Committee—that are occurring in the world and in respect of which the Organization has maintained a cynical and culpable silence. But I should like to point out that in so doing the draft resolution before us is, as it were, stillborn, inasmuch as it is selective and irresponsible.

25. In 1984, the name of George Orwell has been frequently mentioned in the Assembly. The forecast he made for this year presupposed a world in which words had lost their meaning. In what he said or wrote, he reflected in terms of fiction what those who wielded power wanted to say. Therefore, on the façade of the building housing the Ministry of Truth one could read the inscription: "War is peace, Freedom is slavery, Ignorance is strength".

26. The draft resolution submitted to this plenary meeting is Orwellian, inasmuch as it promotes the interests of countries which are ignorant of respect for human rights; it is Orwellian, because it has the support of those who have no concept of democracy, as is the case with the socialist countries of Eastern Europe; it is Orwellian, because it fails to recognize the institutional effort and the ultimately democratic goal of my country's policies; it is Orwellian, because most of the sponsors are accused of serious human rights violations in their own countries; it is Orwellian, because it reflects the irresponsible attitude of the Western European countries which have the moral obligation to understand us but, in actual fact, through the draft resolution are serving only internal political goals.

27. My delegation is against this draft resolution and my country does not recognize the validity of the charges against it. Chile accuses the Organization of not doing its duty, of politicizing the cause of human rights, and of acting selectively and in a discriminatory manner, thus committing an illegal act which is unqualified and invalid from the start.

28. Because of the selectivity, which my delegation rejects, we shall vote against the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.3/39/L.43/Rev.2, on El Salvador, and A/C.3/39/L.77, on Guatemala.

29. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With regard to human rights, Ecuador has constantly maintained as its national policy scrupulous observance of human rights and is very much concerned to see that they are complied with. We believe that human rights constitute an important source of international law. We hold that an essential element in the validity of human rights is their universality. We believe that all selectivity in international bodies in highlighting solely a few countries and singling them out for criticism, while silence is maintained with regard to the overwhelming majority of countries where human rights are being violated, is an inappropriate and unjust method which only serves to weaken the validity and credibility of the system. We believe that the United Nations, once its various pieces of machinery had been put in place, should produce an annual report on the observance of human rights in each and every country in the world. We insist that those who participate in debates and discussions on human rights in other countries should report to the international community, by way of a preliminary contribution, on the status of the observance of these rights in their own territories. In this respect, Ecuador has on various occasions pointed out that it has a democratic way of life based on free elections, total freedom of the press and free entry to and departure from the country for journalists of various media, while the same facilities are afforded citizens of our country and foreigners—without censorship, political prisoners, torture or declarations of a state of emergency. There is freedom of action for all political parties, full equality of rights for men and women and full exercise of labour laws.

30. We firmly maintain that, in so far as Latin America is concerned, it should be essentially Latin Americans who should busy themselves dealing with and solving the problems of the region. Consequently, we reaffirm our constant support for the Contadora Group's efforts to bring about peaceful coexistence in Central America, and we applaud its efforts to bring about agreement on this matter which will in the future, it is hoped, include a convergence of views on the part of the five States of the Central American region which make up the Group.

31. We repeat that it is not universally realistic, equitable or viable for the world Organization systematically to devote itself to criticizing failure to observe human rights solely and exclusively in certain countries of the Latin American region, while it

maintains an ominous silence with regard to well-known and repeated violations in other regions or in the same region.

32. Consequently, Ecuador—out of respect for the duty of universal defence of human rights, and in order to promote the viability of the machinery for ensuring observance of human rights and rejecting their violations in each and every country of the international community—will abstain in the votes on the texts submitted with regard to the three Latin American countries, that is to say, draft resolutions XVIII, XIX and XX in document A/39/700, although in the case of El Salvador the language has been somewhat impartial, this time failing to mention just one sector of the negative aspects of the report of the Special Representative. It was necessary to point out that El Salvador has made progress in the exercise of freedom to vote, without extremism and with the bold initiative of inviting the leaders of the rebels to a free and frank dialogue in order to find democratic solutions and not to resort to arms to forge the destiny of the Salvadorian people, for whose total national and subregional reconciliation our delegation hopes.

33. Finally, Ecuador once again appeals to the sister countries of El Salvador, Chile and Guatemala, as well as other members of the international community, to adopt measures that will contribute to the total and full exercise of human rights on a universal scale.

34. Mr. FAJARDO-MALDONADO (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before casting its vote, the delegation of Guatemala once again wishes to refer to draft resolution XIX in the report of the Third Committee [*A/39/700*], a draft resolution on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala sponsored in the Committee by some European countries.

35. Noting the way in which this body has approached the situation of human rights in the world, we are witnessing once again a repetition of the same selective and discriminatory scenario which has been characteristic of the approach to this subject in previous years. Outside the Latin American countries, which are systematically and politically selected by those who have appointed themselves masters of this system of selectivity, it would appear that the rest of the world is a paradise on earth, an idyllic Utopia where there exists no totalitarianism imposed upon millions of human beings nor operetta-type dictatorships, no political violence, no northern or tropical *gulags*, no racial discrimination or governmental repression, no arms race or arms traffic; where there is no economic oppression, no governmental corruption, no terrorism, no sabotage, no exploitation of peoples by inept or corrupt leaders; where there is no cowardice or cynicism—which is what Latin American countries are being charged with—on the part of those countries involved in exploiting our resources and transacting important economic and commercial deals with our Governments; where there is no discrimination against emigrants from former colonies, no child pornography, no inhuman economic exploitation: in a few words, what there appears to be is respect, total rule and triumph of human rights throughout the rest of the world.

36. This alleged idyllic world is politically disregarded by countries such as those that sponsored the draft resolutions against Guatemala, particularly when there is a discussion on the subject of human rights in general. The existence of this supposed paradise on earth leads to a situation where the standard-bearers of human rights throughout the world do not deal at all with other latitudes because they seem to them to be perfect.

37. My delegation rejects this selective, discriminatory and cynical approach which is used against just one region of the world, Latin America, where three countries have been selected, including Guatemala. When the worst violations of human rights are occurring in the totalitarian areas of other regions of our planet, why, once again, do we find only three draft resolutions? We cannot countenance the hypocrisy of those countries which condemn the violation of human rights in other countries when they themselves are guilty of the same violations and oppress their peoples.

38. My delegation vigorously rejects the selectivity which has been used once again against Latin America, and the small Latin American countries in particular, including Guatemala, and we repeat what we have said in previous statements in the Third Committee. All of this simply helps to erode, weaken and detract from the credibility of and respect for the principles and institutions of human rights, as well as for the United Nations.

39. In casting our vote and rejecting draft resolutions XVIII and XX on El Salvador and Chile, respectively, we similarly vigorously repudiate draft resolution XIX against Guatemala inasmuch as it is selective, discriminatory and notable for its double standards; because it is politicized and because, unacceptably and intolerably, it attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of Guatemala, thus violating and distorting the Charter of the United Nations. Consequently, my country requests a recorded vote.

40. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Even though it has not yet been possible to relegate to the past cases of selectivity whereby only Latin American countries continue to be the target of draft resolutions of the General Assembly, there is no doubt that this year some progress has been achieved towards an objective and balanced appreciation of the situation with regard to human rights in El Salvador, as reflected in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/39/L.71, sponsored by Costa Rica, Venezuela and Singapore in the Third Committee. The resolution could have been voted upon favourably by my delegation, but it was withdrawn as a result of negotiations involving this draft and the one contained in document A/C.3/39/L.43. Part of the philosophy and approach of that draft resolution could have been transferred greatly to the benefit of the content of A/C.3/39/L.43 which, as a result, was the subject of two revisions. However, the origins of the latter draft resolution, and part of its structure and orientation, are still the same as those which prompted Honduras, in previous years, and again this year, to vote against it.

41. In our statement on the subject of Central America on 24 October [*36th meeting*], we highlighted the meeting in La Palma as an exceptional event, motivated by the initiative of the President of El Salvador when he invited, from this very rostrum, his armed opponents to a meeting in the search for reconciliation in that sister country. That gesture and that attitude on the part of the Government of El

Salvador should not be distorted, nor should we disregard the merits of the armed opposition forces in their acceptance of that initiative. Ultimately, the problem of El Salvador should be resolved by the Salvadorians; therefore the only thing we should take into account in this draft resolution is the humanitarian element, allowing the Salvadorians to determine their own political destiny.

42. In our statement in the Third Committee on 9 December last year,[1] we stated, *inter alia*, that although the United Nations should make sure to foster respect for and protection of universal human dignity, resolutions adopted in this body on the situation with regard to human rights in specific countries should bear the mark of strict impartiality and also be marked by pre-eminently humanitarian content, excluding all ideological elements.

43. Consequently, from our point of view, these resolutions should be objective and should include not only charges against legally constituted authorities of the respective States, but also should denounce, equally emphatically, violent actions carried out by the armed opposition forces in the same countries exclusively to achieve power by these means, clearly damaging the human rights and fundamental freedoms of innocent people. Thus, all parties involved in a situation of violence should be urged, without exception, to put an end to all acts of this nature so that loss of human life can cease as well as the sufferings of their respective peoples.

44. Furthermore, we stated that the international community in this kind of resolution should not overlook the decisions and efforts of the Government of the country in question in an attempt to bring about respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. A proper, balanced position obliges us to take note of this attitude and to encourage its development and full effective application, thus also promoting the assistance and international co-operation needed for this purpose. Otherwise, how can we justify the declaration that the United Nations is striving for a better world, if we neither recognize nor support the hopeful signs apparent in the actions of Governments of Member States?

45. There are obvious omissions in draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.43/Rev.2. It fails to mention a grave problem confronting El Salvador, the deprivation of our brothers in El Salvador who have been obliged to leave their homes and work, and take refuge in another part of the territory of the State in the search for protection, personal security and help to meet their elementary needs. Similarly, there is no reference to the voluntary return of Salvadorian refugees which is gradually taking place as a consequence of the efforts of the Government to restore a climate of tolerance and better security in a democratic and constitutional manner.

46. Indeed, if this kind of resolution is to be based on purely humanitarian principles, such as those contained in the Charter of the United Nations itself, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights,[2] we should include estimates or appeals for international co-operation and assistance of an additional nature so that Governments which are finding it difficult to ensure conditions which will make it possible for every individual to enjoy his economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights can fully ensure the exercise of these rights. It is the responsibility of the United Nations, as has often been mentioned in resolutions, to be constantly vigilant against violations of human rights wherever they may occur and thereby to eliminate the selective political approaches which have prevailed hitherto. In this way we would find more effective and objective all the energetic appeals of the international community for respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all human beings.

47. On the basis of what I have just said and because these matters are not reflected in resolution A/C.3/39/L.43/Rev.2, as amended, on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador, my delegation will continue to vote against it.

48. Mr. ROSALES-RIVERA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to state that draft resolution XVIII, on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador, contained in document A/39/700, contains objective paragraphs and elements reflecting the essential elements of the current policy of the Government of President Duarte, which is aimed at bringing about democracy, social and economic reforms, peace and, particularly, respect for human rights. Nevertheless, the origins of the draft resolution were a tendentious, partial and inimical document, the aim of which was to deal with matters which undoubtedly quite deliberately transcended the consideration of human rights and went into subjective and capricious assessments of a political nature, all couched in insulting language. Some of these characteristics have been bequeathed, unfortunately, to this draft resolution approved by the Third Committee.

49. For these reasons, we can only place on record our opposition to the general orientation of the draft resolution and the language of certain paragraphs, in both its operative and preambular parts. Accordingly, the resolution which we are about to vote on turns out to be a mixture of ideas, some positive, some negative, some constructive and some destructive, some relevant to the question of human rights, some highly politicized and falling outside the framework of the subject-matter. The resolution is a poorly worded symbiosis because the language has been changed from the original draft.

50. Throughout the process which produced this Third Committee resolution, our Government considered the various steps and attitudes of the countries which have concerned themselves with it. In this regard we would like to repeat what we stated in the period of time allotted for commenting on draft resolutions in the Committee. On that occasion, with respect to this draft resolution we stated:

> "We are concerned about the action of two of the sponsors. One of them is Mexico, which, together with three other countries in Latin America and with the assent of each of the five Central American countries, has been involved in working for peace in the area. Its attitude with regard to El Salvador, particularly reflected in draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.43 and Rev.1 (which were the reference numbers of the document in the Third Committee), placed the new Salvadorian Government in a dilemma because it precipitated a response to its conduct. We should not forget that it is the five Central American countries which, as sovereign States directly concerned, are responsi-

ble for ensuring the indispensable elements in the search for a negotiated and global settlement to bring about peace in Central America. Consequently, the following question arises: is it permissible for a third party to assume the role of the accuser of the Salvadorian Government and, at the same time, permit itself to continue to be a fully-fledged member of a group which is attempting to find a peace settlement by common accord among the five Central American Governments? Undoubtedly, all States in this Assembly will understand that there are certain lines of conduct which cannot be carried on in parallel with each other and cannot be carried out simultaneously without incompatibility. It is intolerable for a State to set itself up as an accuser and, at the same time, as an honest broker. We would like this to be clear to all members of the General Assembly so that in the future we will not be told that El Salvador was acting inopportunely."[3]

51. Other Latin American countries exerted a constructive influence with a view to ensuring that the original draft resolution was amended and brought further into line with the realities of what is occurring in El Salvador and with the report of the Special Representative, and that it recognized the tremendous efforts of the Government of President Duarte in the field of human rights, peace and the promotion of democracy. These countries have our undying gratitude. But, inasmuch as there has been a change in the original concept of the draft resolution, it still contains this interventionist streak and too great a degree of partiality.

52. We will not go into an analysis of each of its paragraphs since the general spirit of the draft resolution is inappropriate and it is riddled with political prejudice. However, we recognize that it has some positive elements. The draft resolution refers to the adoption of a new government policy and it states that because of that there has been a marked decrease in the number of human rights violations. It mentions the elections of 6 May this year and that President Duarte of El Salvador has a mandate to bring about social harmony and internal peace, and it recognizes the obvious desire of the new Government to establish a democracy governed by the rule of law and guaranteeing full respect for human rights. It welcomes the initiative, announced by President Duarte in the Assembly, in initiating a dialogue with the armed opposition, implicitly gives recognition to the socio-economic reforms which have been undertaken in El Salvador, and states that the hostilities of the guerrilla forces have caused civilian victims and material damage to the economic infrastructure of El Salvador.

53. Our delegation must point out that we once again reject the selective and discriminatory manner in which, principally for political reasons, the subject of human rights is treated in the General Assembly.

54. For all the reasons I have mentioned and because the draft resolution in its present version still contains negative elements, has an interventionist streak and bespeaks a philosophy which is damaging to the national interests represented by the present Government of the Republic, we are obliged to vote against it.

55. Mr. ODOCH-JATO (Uganda): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on three draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 12, namely, draft resolution XVIII, entitled "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador", draft resolution XIX, entitled "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala", and draft resolution XX, entitled "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile".

56. Since 1979, Uganda has consistently voted in favour of similar resolutions on the three situations. We shall do so again today. We deem it necessary to make this explanation of vote in view of the fact that my delegation inadvertently and mistakenly abstained on the three resolutions in the voting in the Third Committee.

57. I wish to give the assurance that Uganda's position in respect of the three situations remains unchanged. As we had occasion to reiterate in our statement on item 12 at the 65th meeting of the Committee, Uganda maintains its solidarity with the peoples of Latin America. We continue to support them in their quest for social justice and the freedom to determine their own destinies without outside interference, intervention or aggression. For that reason, we shall continue to contribute to all efforts aimed at achieving improvements in the human rights situations in El Salvador, Guatemala and Chile. In our view, the draft resolutions now before the Assembly constitute an important effort in that direction.

58. Mr. ALBÁN-HOLGUÍN (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): No sensible observer in the United Nations, an Organization the essential task of which is to protect human rights, could but be sceptical if he had access to the voting record on resolutions under nearly all the important items dealt with in the Third Committee. An observer could not be enthusiastic about the results of the voting on resolutions condemning the policy of *apartheid*. He would think that so many denunciations of these cruel and hideous practices—practices including the denunciation by Bishop Tutu, when he received the Nobel Peace Prize recently, and dramatically recounted the innumerable cases of innocent children murdered, families separated, fundamental human rights denied to the victims of *apartheid*—would have had some echo; that resolutions such as resolution 39/17 adopted at the 71st meeting, on 23 November, on the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, in which the Assembly "*Strongly condemns* the continued violations of the human rights of the peoples still under colonial domination", would, as Bishop Tutu recommended in his Nobel award speech, be greeted with enthusiasm. Our observer would be confused to see that countries such as Sweden, France, the Netherlands, Canada, Italy, Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway and Australia voted against that resolution and that Austria, Ireland, Spain, Greece and Portugal abstained in the voting.

59. But when it came to the debate on possible means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, our observer would note with renewed optimism the emergence of a draft resolution on the right to development, which, in expressing concern at the existing disparity between the established norms and principles and the actual situation with regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms in the world, affirms that it is necessary to promote the right to education, work, health and sufficient food to ensure the full enjoyment of all

human rights and the total dignity of the human person, and that therefore the Commission on Human Rights should adopt measures to promote the right to development.

60. Our observer would be gravely disappointed, however, to realize that, far from being approved by consensus, in the voting on this draft resolution countries such as Sweden, Denmark, Canada, Austria, Ireland and Norway abstained; and he would be totally confused in seeing that it was precisely Sweden, Denmark, Canada, the Netherlands, Austria, Ireland, Norway, France, Spain, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg and Australia which, in the context of item 12, on the situation with regard to human rights, decided to criticize three Latin American countries as if throughout the world there did not exist all other kinds of the most grave violations of the dignity of the human being.

61. Why that selectivity? Why pick out Latin America for mention as the sole violator of human rights? Is it not clear that such practices bring the United Nations into disrepute?

62. Believers in the United Nations will have ceased to believe and will have become convinced that, far from protecting human rights, it is the scene of a shady political game to cover up other realities.

63. Why is there continual disregard of the fact that in Latin America not only is there a great trend towards true democratization but countries with long democratic traditions are actively seeking solutions in order to establish peace in countries today affected by violence? Another Nobel Prize winner, the Colombian García Marquez, said:

> "Latin America does not want to be considered a pawn or a chimera whose intended independence and originality are changed to fit Western aspirations. . . . Why should the originality freely conceded to us in literature be denied to us with such suspicion when we try, with great difficulty, to bring about social change? Why should it be thought that social justice, which the advanced Europeans are trying to impose in their own countries, cannot also be a Latin American objective, with its own distinct methods, in different circumstances? No. The immoderate violence and suffering of our history are the result of countless age-old, bitter injustices, not a plot hatched 3,000 leagues away. But many European leaders and thinkers have believed this, with the childishness of old people who forget the prolific folly of their youth, as if they had no other possible future than to live at the mercy of the two great masters of the world."

64. The sponsors of the draft resolution on the situation with regard to human rights in El Salvador understood on this occasion that the Latin American countries could contribute to the search for solutions, and agreed to change the content and language of the original draft resolution substantially, recognizing the role of President Duarte in taking certain initiatives. My Government applauds him and is grateful to him for this. In recognition of this political integrity, Colombia will vote in favour of that draft resolution.

65. For all the reasons that I have given, we cannot support the draft resolutions on Guatemala and Chile.

66. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting on the recommendations of the Third Committee. The Assembly will now take a decision on the 20 draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 69 of its report [*A/39/700*].

67. Draft resolution I, entitled "Measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. The programme budget implications of the draft resolution are contained in the relevant report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/805/Rev.1*]. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/102).

68. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Question of the international legal protection of the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/39/805/Rev.1. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/103).

69. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolutions III to VII, entitled "Assistance to refugees in Somalia", "Assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia", "Emergency assistance to returnees and displaced persons in Chad", "Humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti" and "Situation of refugees in the Sudan", respectively, were adopted together by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolutions III to VII were adopted (resolutions 39/104 to 39/108).

70. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VIII, entitled "Assistance to student refugees in southern Africa", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 39/109).

71. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IX, entitled "Summary or arbitrary executions", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 39/110).

72. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution X, entitled "Question of enforced or involuntary disappearances", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 39/111).

73. The PRESIDENT: We turn to draft resolution XI, entitled "Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders", which was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 39/112).

74. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XII, entitled "United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 39/113).

75. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XIII, entitled "Measures to be taken against Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities and all other forms of totalitarian ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 39/114).

76. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XIV, entitled "Regional arrangements for the protection of human rights", was also adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 39/115).

77. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XV, entitled "Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights in the Asian region", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 39/116).

78. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XVI, entitled "Human rights and mass exoduses", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVI was adopted (resolution 39/117).

79. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XVII, entitled "Human rights in the administration of justice", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 39/118).

80. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution XVIII, which is entitled "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru,[4] Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Bangladesh, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Paraguay, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Romania, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Zaire.

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted by 93 votes to 11, with 40 abstentions (resolution 39/119).[4]

81. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution XIX, entitled "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bangladesh, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Guinea, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire.

Draft resolution XIX was adopted by 85 votes to 11, with 47 abstentions (resolution 39/120).[5]

82. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft resolution XX, entitled "Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bangladesh, Brazil, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Lebanon, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Belize, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Yemen, Zaire.

Draft resolution XX was adopted by 90 votes to 13, with 40 abstentions (resolution 39/121).[5]

83. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

84. Mr. VILLAGRA DELGADO (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution XVIII because human rights constitute a legitimate interest of the United Nations and because the General Assembly should concern itself with violations of those rights wherever they occur. However, the Argentine delegation would like to point out that it considers that this year, 1984, has seen positive progress in the situation in El Salvador, represented particularly by the elections and the dialogue initiated by President Duarte with the opposition forces. Argentina believes that these positive factors will contribute to improving the human rights situation in the sister republic of El Salvador.

85. Mrs. PAPAJORGJI (Albania) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Albanian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution XVIII, in accordance with the policy of the Government of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania in support of the just struggle of peoples. In spite of that, our delegation would point out that it has reservations on certain paragraphs of this resolution.

86. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has concluded its consideration of all the chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council allocated to the Third Committee. We will now turn to the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 92 [*A/39/701*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/122).

87. The PRESIDENT: We will now consider the report of the Committee on agenda item 93 [*A/39/702*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 22 of its report. Draft resolution I, entitled "The role of women in society", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that it is also the wish of the Assembly to adopt that draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/123).

88. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Participation of women in promoting international peace and co-operation", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/124).

89. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled "Arrangements for the future management of the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/125).

90. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV, entitled "Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 39/126).

91. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "Senior women's programme officers posts at the regional commissions". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 135 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions (resolution 39/127).

92. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VI, entitled "Integration of women in all aspects of development", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 39/128).

93. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft resolution VII, entitled "Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/39/812. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 39/129).

94. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

95. Mrs. QUINTANILLA (United States of America): Draft resolution I in document A/39/702 is a compromise text reflecting differing views of Member States on the role of women in society, particularly as mothers.

96. Over all, American public policy recognizes and supports the basic principle that parents have the primary responsibility for childbearing, child care, child rearing and the education of their children. Parental love and responsibility provide a sound basis for children to develop their full potential. The task of Government and society is not to replace the primary role of the family, but to encourage and defend it.

97. With regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the United States has established legal procedures to combat inequities in employment opportunities and practices which discriminate against women. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 prohibits unequal pay for women and men in the same establishment whose jobs require equal effort, skill and responsibility. Because we believe the phrase "equal pay for work of equal value" has this meaning, the United States was able to support it.

98. We would not have been able to do so, however, had the ill-defined and unproved concept of "comparable worth" been raised. Many economists have criticized this concept, which seeks to deal with the disparity in the average wage earnings of men and women through a system of determining the relative value of different jobs in setting wages. This theory is a developing area of law and of lively legislative debate in the United States. It is not current Federal law or practice, although it is a matter currently being considered by various courts and local governments.

99. Regarding paragraph 4, Federal law in the United States, while protecting the rights of pregnant workers, does not mandate paid maternity leave. This is a matter reserved for negotiations between employers and their employees. The Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 requires that employers, for all employment-related purposes—including the receipt of benefits under fringe benefit programmes—treat women affected by pregnancy, childbirth and related medical conditions in the same manner as other persons not so affected, but similar in their ability or inability to work. This law, which applies to employers with 15 or more employees, does not require employers to provide special benefits or new programmes, such as paid maternity leave for pregnant workers.

100. The same law states that an employer cannot refuse to hire a pregnant woman so long as she is able to perform the major functions necessary to the job. An employer may not terminate workers because of pregnancy, force them to go on leave at an arbitrary date if they are still able to work, or penalize them because of pregnancy in reinstatement rights, including credit for previous service, accrued retirement benefits and acquired seniority. Since 1972, similar provisions have also been part of the sex discrimination guidelines issued by the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

101. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to the report of the Committee on agenda item 94 [*A/39/703*]. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications is contained in document A/39/803. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Morocco.

The draft resolution was adopted by 142 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/130).

102. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Committee on agenda item 95 [*A/39/704*] and take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. That draft resolution was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/131).

103. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their positions.

104. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): On the resolution just adopted, the Sierra Leonean delegation would like to state the following. In Sierra Leone, spires and minarets punctuate the townscape of the country, evidence of the strong and living influence of religion in the life of the nation. Christian, Islamic and African religious expression coexist and thrive in an atmosphere of mutual respect and tolerance. Today in Sierra Leone there are different Christian denominations. Anglican, Roman Catholic, Evangelical, United Brethren, Methodist and West African Methodist, Baptist and a number of other congregations coexist in harmony in a climate of religious freedom and tolerance.

105. The influence of Islam in Sierra Leone predates that of Christianity. From time immemorial, the modern pattern of tolerance and mutual respect between Christianity and Islam has been established, the two uniting in the anti-colonialist movement and also joined in a common culture. Both the Christian and Islamic communities in my country offer facilities for worship in the vernacular to various sections of the community.

106. African religion is deeply rooted in the history of Sierra Leone. Its fundamental values—worship of the Creator, recognition of family and communal responsibilities and respect for the wisdom of our ancestors—provide an ethical foundation compatible with Christianity and Islam and act as a cohesive force throughout the country at a time of rapid development and changing life-styles.

107. Against that background of religious tolerance and freedom in my country and the need to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, it will be understandable why the Sierra Leone delegation is concerned that intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief continue to exist in some countries.

108. The Sierra Leone delegation firmly believes that religion is a matter of the heart and is a bond between the individual and whom or what he believes in. We also maintain that it is not a matter that should be determined, established or disestablished by parliament, decree, ordinance or in any other manner for that matter. My delegation believes it is the inherent right of the individual to declare and practise his faith.

109. We would therefore like to urge those Governments which proscribe or attempt to proscribe one religious denomination or another and persecute its followers on the ground that it is not the true or authentic religion to refrain from such a practice.

110. On the other hand, the Sierra Leone delegation endorses paragraphs 2 and 3 of the resolution just adopted, which urge all States to give continuing attention to the need for adequate legislation to prohibit discrimination based on religion or belief in the recognition, exercise and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms and to combat intolerance based on religion or belief.

111. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to the report of the Committee on agenda item 96 [*A/39/705*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendations of the Committee contained in paragraph 11 of its report.

112. First, the Assembly will take a decision on draft resolution I, entitled "Implications of scientific and technological developments for human rights", which the Committee adopted without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/132).

113. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution II, entitled "Human rights and scientific and technological developments". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 21 abstentions (resolution 39/133).

114. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we turn to draft resolution III, entitled "Human rights and use of scientific and technological developments". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 124 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions (resolution 39/134).

115. The PRESIDENT: We will now turn our attention to the report of the Committee on agenda item 97 [*A/39/706*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Question of a convention on the rights of the child", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/135).

116. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Committee on agenda item 98 [*A/39/707*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 15 of its report.

117. Draft resolution I, entitled "International Covenants on Human Rights", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/136).

118. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Elaboration of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay, Poland, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 64 votes to 19, with 55 abstentions (resolution 39/137).

119. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled "Reporting obligations of States parties to United Nations conventions on human rights", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/138).

120. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Committee on agenda item 100 [*A/39/709*] and take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 12 of its report.

121. Draft resolution I, entitled "Second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/139).

122. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/39/804. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/140).

123. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Committee on agenda item 101 [*A/39/710*] and take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 16 of its report.

124. Draft resolution I, entitled "Draft Convention against Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances and Related Activities", was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/141).

125. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Declaration on the Control of Drug Trafficking and Drug Abuse", was also adopted in the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/142).

126. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "International campaign against traffic in drugs". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/39/768. The draft resolution was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/143).

127. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Committee on agenda item 102 [*A/39/711*] and take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 13 of its report.

128. The Assembly will take action first on draft resolution I, entitled "National institutions for the protection and promotion of human rights", which was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/144).

129. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution II, entitled "Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 131 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/145).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)*

130. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the draft resolutions contained in documents A/39/L.19 and Corr.1 and Add.1, L.20 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and L.21 and Corr.1 and Add.1. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any or all of the three draft resolutions. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes have been taken. I should like to remind the Assembly that, under rule 88 of the rules of procedure: "The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment."

131. Mr. FARRELL (Ireland): I wish to make a statement on the draft resolutions on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community. The views of the Ten on the principles necessary to secure peace in the Middle East are well known and were set out in our address to the General Assembly on this item [*74th meeting*].

132. It will be clear that the Ten have serious reservations on those draft resolutions that address themselves to important aspects of the question of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute and that are not in accordance with their common position regarding principles for a comprehensive peace settlement. Consequently, the Ten have repeatedly stressed the need for such draft resolutions to adopt a balanced approach. Also, the Ten cannot accept formulations criticizing a permanent member of the Security Council for exercising its right under the Charter of the United Nations. In connection with draft resolution A/39/L.21, which the Ten will support, they recall the importance they attach to Security Council resolution 478 (1980).

---

*Resumed from the 77th meeting.

133. Mr. GROSER (New Zealand): New Zealand has always supported Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. That resolution affirms the right of every State to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. We regard that as fundamental and it applies to Israel as much as to any State.

134. No less fundamental is the right of the people of Palestine to decide their own future and to establish their own State if they wish to. Resolution 242 (1967) reaffirms the principle that territory cannot legitimately be acquired by force. New Zealand believes that Israel should withdraw from the territories it seized by force in 1967 and has occupied ever since. We do not recognize the validity of a number of acts taken by Israel in defiance of this principle. These acts include the annexation of East Jerusalem, the extension to the Golan Heights of Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration, and the establishment of new settlements on land that has been seized in the occupied West Bank.

135. My delegation is disappointed that draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 do not adequately reflect the balance of principles embodied in resolution 242 (1967). As such, they are not well calculated to contribute to a negotiated settlement. We shall be obliged to abstain on those two draft resolutions.

136. New Zealand will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.21, concerning Jerusalem. New Zealand does not recognize Israel's annexation of Jerusalem. We do not recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. New Zealand has supported a special administrative régime for Jerusalem which safeguards the right of access of all religions.

137. Mr. CHEOK (Singapore): Before voting on the draft resolutions, my delegation wishes to express its concern over the lack of progress towards a lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and to emphasize the urgent need for progress to this end. My delegation also reaffirms our support for the efforts in favour of the re-establishment of the full sovereignty, territorial integrity, national independence and unity of Lebanon. We can only add our voice to those calling for a halt to the hostilities in the troubled region and for a renewed effort to seek a negotiated settlement that will include the following elements: first, withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon other than those invited by the Government of Lebanon; secondly, withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967; thirdly, self-determination and a homeland for the Palestinian people; and fourthly, the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force, as embodied in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

138. On the basis of the foregoing understanding, my delegation is unable to support draft resolutions that do not recognize the legitimate rights of the State of Israel, or those that are selective and unbalanced in their condemnation, or those impinging on the sovereign rights of third countries having diplomatic relations with Israel. However, we support all efforts aimed at restoring the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and a return to a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

139. My delegation will accordingly vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.21 and will abstain on L.20.

140. Mr. BARBOSA DE MEDINA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): During its intervention on the question of the Middle East at the thirty-eighth session [*102nd meeting*], my delegation had the opportunity to define some of the essential principles underlying our votes on the draft resolutions before us. We mentioned the principle of non-use of force in international relations and also the principle whereby armed occupation does not create any territorial rights and cannot give rise to valid agreements unless they include the restoration of territories occupied by force. We invoked the fundamental right of all States to live within secure and recognized boundaries, with the withdrawal of all foreign troops in respect for the sovereignty of countries. We also denounced any unilateral decision liable to modify the juridical status of the territories under military occupation in violation of the applicable norms of international law.

141. Furthermore, we did not fail to express our conviction that it would be a lack of realism to concede the possibility of achieving a solution to the problems of the Middle East without finding a solution to the Palestinian question, a question whose importance is both particular and universal in the light of all the interests at stake and all the risks involved, and one which creates such a grave situation from the point of view of the security of States because of its human dimensions. Based on these considerations, my delegation supported draft resolutions A/39/L.37 to L.40, on the question of Palestine, that were voted on last Tuesday [*95th meeting*].

142. Indeed, any lasting settlement of these problems presupposes justice for the Palestinians, for the oppression of one people by another or the annexation of occupied territories can never be a valid basis for a negotiated settlement. We have to find a comprehensive solution which involves all the interested parties. A negotiated settlement must be sought based on consultation, and thus the search for a peaceful solution must exclude any acts which may be prejudicial thereto.

143. Portugal will continue to support all diplomatic initiatives and all efforts aimed at implementing the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, as measures likely to prevent destabilization and escalation of violence in the region, and also the threats to international security flowing from such conditions. My Government is looking for a framework for a negotiated settlement in which any dispute in the Middle East will be examined, including its relationship to the whole problem and the legitimate interests of the parties. In this context, as long as there is well-founded hope of efforts being consummated which will reverse the feelings of mutual distrust and fear that have ceaselessly worsened over the last few decades, my delegation believes that it is its duty to dissociate itself from any initiative that may render negotiations more difficult. We shall do this particularly in connection with draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20, which, because of their language, advocate certain measures, but have discriminatory implications or juridical implications that would make more difficult the dialogue on which, in our view, a peaceful solution to the Middle East problem should be based.

144. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the consistent policy of Ecuador of rejecting the occupation of territories by force and of searching for a just and comprehensive solution to the problem of the Middle East, with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties involved, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations which provide for the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and the cessation of all hostile activities in those territories, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.21, although we do not agree with the wording of some paragraphs in L.19. We will abstain on draft resolution A/39/L.20, inasmuch as it contains paragraphs which detract from the principle of the universality of the United Nations and decisions that are the prerogatives of sovereign States, which, under no circumstances, should be subordinate to decisions or exhortations from third parties or international organizations.

145. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): Nepal's position on the question of the Middle East has been made clear in various forums, including the General Assembly. In this we are clearly guided by the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. We have therefore called for the withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967.

146. Secondly, Nepal has made it clear that the Palestinian question is central to any solution of the Middle East problem. As such, we continue firmly to believe that the rights of the Palestinian people should be respected, including its right to statehood. It is imperative that the Palestinians, as represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*] should be a partner to any settlement of the question.

147. Thirdly, Nepal has made it unequivocally clear that all the States in the region, including Israel, should have the right to live within secure and recognized boundaries.

148. In our view these principles are the only realistic basis to establish a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. We consider that Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) contain the essential elements which provide the appropriate framework for the solution of the problem in the Middle East.

149. My delegation would like to express its grave concern over the situation in Lebanon. That small, non-aligned country has been the subject of violence, tension and foreign aggression. We once again call upon Israel to withdraw its forces from that country without any pre-condition. Lebanese sovereign authority should be re-established over all the territory of Lebanon without any foreign interference. In this respect we commend the Secretary-General for promoting talks currently being held between Israel and Lebanon. We hope that the talks will result in agreements which will facilitate Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon and which will help Lebanon eventually to re-establish its authority and territorial integrity over the whole of Lebanon. We hope the talks will also help to create conditions for UNIFIL to play a more effective role in the future.

150. Guided by this position, we will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 because we have found that the general thrust of these draft resolutions is in keeping with what I have stated earlier.

151. However, we are not in a position to support all the provisions and language in draft resolution A/39/L.20. The delegation of Nepal reserves its position on the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 8, 9, 12, 13 and 14 of that draft resolution. The provisions of those paragraphs run counter to the declared policies and perceptions of my Government with regard to the situation in the Middle East. Furthermore, the initiation of measures called for in the operative paragraphs is the prerogative of the Security Council, which alone has the power to adopt the measures it deems necessary under the Charter of the United Nations.

152. Regarding draft resolution A/39/L.19, my delegation reserves its position on paragraphs 10 and 11.

153. Finally, my delegation would have liked reference to be made to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which, in our opinion, constitute the only realistic basis for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East dispute.

154. Mr. GARCÍA REVILLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru wishes to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/39/L.20 and L.19.

155. My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.20 because we think it contains certain considerations and recommendations whose orientation, far from contributing to a just, integral and lasting solution to the Middle East problem, tends to prejudice efforts and possibilities for bringing about a solution within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

156. We do not think adoption of the methods proposed in draft resolution A/39/L.20 is the best path for initiating a peace process in the region. On the contrary, it implies the danger of leading to infringement of some of the principles and norms of international law and an erosion of the effectiveness of the United Nations.

157. We will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.19. However, we should like to make quite clear our objections to the interpretation which may be derived from the wording of paragraphs 6, 10 and 11. In the light of the gravity and the continuing deterioration of the situation in the Middle East, we believe that none of these paragraphs fully recognizes the importance of initiatives for peace in this region and that references to relations between given States or other States should be strictly linked to the question of Palestine as the central problem, to respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and to the need to reject and avoid the carrying out of policies or acts which would infringe the proposed objective of bringing about a political settlement in the Middle East. Finally, my delegation would like to see an explicit reference in draft resolution A/39/L.19 to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which for my country continue to provide an acceptable and just basis for bringing the parties to an understanding.

158. Mr. PHIRI (Malawi): We are again called upon to consider the situation in the Middle East. My delegation holds the firm view that the situation in that region will elude a peaceful settlement as long as we continue to ignore important principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. In our

view, the main elements of these principles are: first, recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination; and secondly, recognition of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the State of Israel and of the role that the General Assembly should play in resolving the conflict in the Middle East.

159. My delegation supports self-determination for the Palestinian people and at the same time supports the right of Israel to exist as a sovereign State within secure borders, on the basis of the right of all States in the region to coexist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, with justice and security for all people. We support the call that all the parties to the conflict must be allowed to participate in the process of negotiating a comprehensive and just settlement of the dispute.

160. For those reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.21. However, we shall abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20. We are motivated by a deep-rooted conviction that there is still sufficient room for a just and amicable solution to the dispute through negotiation.

161. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My Government's position regarding the problem of Palestine is quite clear. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.19, L.20 and L.21, but with the following reservations.

162. First, we make no distinction between those territories that were occupied before 1967 and those occupied since. We therefore believe that the Zionist usurpers must withdraw from the whole of Palestine and not simply from the territories occupied since 1967.

163. Secondly, paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/39/L.19 is not acceptable to us. Therefore, we also declare our reservation on that paragraph, which we regard as a continuation or version of the Camp David accord—or, rather, the Camp David conspiracy.

164. Our solution to the problem of Palestine and the Middle East is simply the united Islamic front.

165. Mr. ARTACHO (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the end of our consideration of the question of Palestine last Tuesday [*95th meeting*], my delegation took the opportunity to state Spain's position on that subject and on the Middle East conflict. Today I want simply to repeat the well-known position of the Spanish delegation with regard to that conflict.

166. A final solution, and with it the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, should be based on Israel's withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, on the right of all States in the area, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized borders, and on respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination.

167. In accordance with that position of principle, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.21.

168. My delegation supports the essential elements for a solution to the Middle East problem set out in draft resolution A/39/L.19. We regard as acceptable paragraphs 4, 6 and 13, in that the Arab peace plan embodied in the Final Declaration[9] adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, and an international peace conference on the Middle East should not exclude other possible plans or means of bringing about a peaceful, negotiated solution to the Middle East problem. However, we cannot support paragraphs 10, 11 and 12, and therefore we shall be obliged to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

169. Finally, my delegation endorses the spirit of draft resolution A/39/L.20, inasmuch as it reflects the principles underlying Spain's position on the Middle East problem and, specifically, in that it rejects the expansionist policy of the Israeli authorities and condemns the measures to annex the Golan Heights. Nevertheless, the legal problems and the political implications of the penultimate preambular paragraph, paragraphs 8 and 9 and, in particular, paragraphs 12, 13 and 14, make it impossible for us to vote for the draft resolution.

170. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My country will vote for the three draft resolutions. We wish to reaffirm our established position on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East, and therefore we must state that we have reservations about any reference that can be interpreted, directly or indirectly, as my country's recognition of the Zionist, racist entity or a legitimization of a *fait accompli* imposed by force.

171. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): Three days ago [95th meeting], I had occasion to explain the United States votes against the set of four draft resolutions submitted under the item "Question of Palestine". I wish today to state that the United States also opposes and will vote against draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 because they are, if possible, more unfair, more unbalanced, more prejudicial, more dysfunctional than the four resolutions which the Assembly considered on Tuesday, against which we spoke then. At that time we stated how utterly inconsistent and unproductive it was to accuse a State of being non-peace-loving and then, in virtually the same breath, to urge that State to attend an international conference devoted to the search for peace, as though that country, already branded a non-peace-loving State, might expect fair play from such a conference.

172. We also stated that this context, this prejudicial preparation for a conference, this judgement in advance—this prior judgement—could not possibly lead to good-faith negotiations, and we suggested that negotiations lacking good faith were not negotiations at all in any meaningful sense of that term. Such so-called negotiations would instead simply serve as a propaganda forum, a propaganda exercise, which would certainly make the attainment of peace more difficult, rather than contribute to the achievement of that desirable goal.

173. The United States opposes such a Middle East conference, but we also note that any positive possibility such a conference might conceivably have is undermined by resolutions of this type.

174. The United States also strenuously objected to the unfair treatment and disrespect shown in those draft resolutions on the question of Palestine to the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations. One of those draft resolutions, A/39/L.40, regretted the negative response of two Governments towards such a conference. I mention that reference because one of the draft resolutions before the

Assembly today—A/39/L.19—makes an equally inappropriate and unacceptable reference to the United States and to the way my country conducts its foreign policy. Once again, there is an unwarranted and unjustified interference in the internal affairs and decision-making of the United States. Once again, I should remind the General Assembly that the Charter of the United Nations does not give it jurisdiction over the foreign policy of the United States.

175. Paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/39/L.19 considers that the co-operative agreements between the United States and Israel "would encourage Israel to pursue its aggressive and expansionist policies". The United States considers this a false and offensive statement. We also consider it misleading as to the likely consequences of our policies.

176. Last night [99th meeting], the General Assembly undertook to correct an abusive practice which has prevailed in the Assembly for some time. It took note of the practice of singling out particular countries for special criticism and, more important, last night we all took a step in the direction of correcting that abuse. As this body is aware, selective name-calling is almost entirely reserved for the United States and Israel. It is very selective indeed. The Soviet Union goes unnamed in the resolution on Afghanistan; Viet Nam goes unnamed in the resolution on Kampuchea. In both of those cases, aggressive, expansionist invasions, indeed, and occupations are under way; yet no names are named. In the draft resolutions before us there is fear that some policy might lead to an aggressive, expansionist policy; yet names are named.

177. Last night, however, the General Assembly took the wise and courageous step of removing four derogatory references to the United States. That was done in the interest of fairness and justice and in the interest of the ability of the United Nations to play a constructive role in the future. We hope that the General Assembly will do no less today. That is why my delegation has asked for a separate recorded vote on paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/39/L.19. We would hope that this needed corrective action would continue.

178. But we are faced today with another draft resolution—A/39/L.20—which, through its slightly veiled reference to a permanent member of the Security Council "which prevented the Council" from adopting sanctions against Israel, would continue this obnoxious practice of selective name-calling.

179. Those are my country's strong objections to the singularly offensive treatment of the United States in these draft resolutions, and indeed too often in this debate. They alone constitute ample reason for voting against the two draft resolutions, but there is more, and that goes to the thrust and overall purpose of the draft resolutions. They speak repeatedly of "aggression", of "threats to international peace and security" and "the maintenance of international peace", of Israel as not being a peace-loving Member State and of wide-ranging sanctions in the military, diplomatic, economic, technological and cultural fields. They "condemn", "strongly condemn", "reject", "deplore", "strongly deplore" and so forth.

180. The people of the Middle East—all the people of the Middle East, Arabs, Israelis and all other peoples of that region—desire peace. They need peace. They deserve better from this Assembly than the negative finger-pointing which these draft resolutions contain. They deserve a positive approach, hopeful ideas and a constructive spirit to come out of our debates. They deserve good faith.

181. The United States, for its part, will not be distracted, nor will it flag in its efforts to work for peace between Israel and its neighbours. It believes that the basis for achieving such a goal already exists in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which call for direct negotiations and secure borders for all States in the region.

182. A focus in our debates on practical means to implement those two resolutions could go far towards bringing an equitable and comprehensive solution to at least one major dispute in the Middle East.

183. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): Predictably, the agenda item before the Assembly has been exploited to assist the campaign of the Arab States against Israel, thereby undermining a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict. The draft resolutions before the Assembly vividly illustrate this.

184. Draft resolution A/39/L.19 is a synopsis of the elements underlying all the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 33, on the question of Palestine. Its purpose is precisely the same as that of the other resolutions, namely, to impede a peaceful solution to the Arab-Israel conflict.

185. Especially outrageous are paragraphs 10 and 11, which suggest that war can and should be waged against Israel through the use of United Nations machinery. It is consequently an anti-peace draft resolution and as such must be rejected.

186. Draft resolution A/39/L.20 is a blatant attempt to harm Israel and legitimize Arab aggressions of the past. For years, the Golan Heights served as a launching ground for Syrian attacks against Israel. However, instead of condemning Syria, the chief menace to peace in our area today, the draft resolution castigates Israel. Instead of calling for negotiations and conciliation, the draft resolution grotesquely calls on States to refrain from supplying Israel, the object of repeated Arab aggression, with the necessary means to defend itself. It seeks to isolate Israel so that Arab warmongers may be emboldened to strike across its borders. In its extremist language, this draft resolution stands out even among the other proposals against Israel.

187. Regarding Jerusalem, dealt with in draft resolution A/39/L.21, Israel's position is well known. For the Jewish people, Jerusalem has always been the centre of their national and spiritual life. Reunited since 1967, Jerusalem enjoys freedom and prosperity unprecedented in the city's history. In glaring contrast with the situation which prevailed in Jerusalem before 1967, the adherents of all faiths are guaranteed free access to their holy places of worship.

188. Israel will steadfastly continue to advance the peace and well-being of our capital and its inhabitants, as well as the preservation of Jerusalem's unique place in the hearts of people of diverse faiths.

189. In focusing on the Arab-Israel dispute within the context of the situation in the Middle East, the General Assembly is doing considerable harm to the cause of peace. It totally neglects the many conflicts in the area and their underlying causes. My delegation will not lend a hand to this distortion. We shall vote against the draft resolutions on this agenda item

and call upon the delegations of those States committed to peace to do likewise.

190. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote. I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

191. Mr. SCHIFTER (United States of America): I would like to clarify an issue of procedure.

192. Yesterday [*98th meeting*], acting under Article 18, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly decided that the *apartheid* draft resolution was an important question requiring a two-thirds vote on the principal proposal and any subsidiary question. Paragraph 3, as we will all recall, allows the General Assembly to add by majority vote "additional categories of questions" requiring a two-thirds majority. These are categories additional to the categories set out in Article 18, paragraph 2.

193. It will be recalled that we objected yesterday to a motion under Article 18, paragraph 3, which gives the General Assembly the option to declare a matter an important question. As we made clear, we were deeply concerned that the option to make this change was put before the General Assembly so very late in the game. By contrast, we are now raising a different issue. It is an issue arising out of Article 18, paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 is mandatory, not optional. It mandates—it by law requires—a two-thirds vote on certain categories of issues.

194. To make absolutely clear what we are talking about, I shall read the relevant material from the Charter that will clarify the point I am trying to make. Yesterday the issue arose, as I indicated, under Article 18, paragraph 3, which reads as follows:

> "Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting."

195. The issue that our delegation is putting before the Assembly is the following: under Article 18, paragraph 2, there is no choice, there is no option, there is no freedom for the General Assembly to decide the matter one way or the other. There is a mandate to vote certain issues by a two-thirds vote, and I quote Article 18, paragraph 2:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include:"—and the first category is—"recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security . . . ."

It then goes on to speak of various other matters that we all know about, such as elections to the Security Council. But the point to be made is that Article 18, paragraph 2, requires a two-thirds vote on any draft resolution that constitutes a recommendation with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security. Our point is that there is no choice.

196. Now as draft resolution A/39/L.19 calls for the commencing of a peace conference and speaks of the efforts to establish peace, and of threats to international security, and also as draft resolution A/39/L.20 makes a judgement that Israel's actions constitute a continuing threat to international peace and security, both draft resolutions clearly fall under the provisions of Article 18, paragraph 2. The necessary consequence is that the draft resolutions and all subsidiary votes require a two-thirds majority for adoption.

197. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

198. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I totally disagree with the interpretation presented by the representative of the United States. What is meant by the paragraph just read out to us is not any reference to any world peace or world order. International peace and order is often referred to in all paragraphs of the various documents of the United Nations. To make decisions on peace and war is something different from speaking about peace, and the references to peace in the two paragraphs to which the representative of the United States referred are general references to peace and not decisions on peace or war. Therefore, they are totally different from the implication of Article 18.

199. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Democratic Yemen on a point of order.

200. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): This is the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. For 39 years, every year, we have had resolutions on the Middle East on which we have voted, customarily, by simple majority. All of a sudden, today the representative of the United States sees this to be an important matter under Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations. I am not going to say that this is not only an insincere and unfair method being used by the United States delegation but I want only to mention that the United States has never taken the resolutions of the General Assembly so seriously that it can now cite Article 18 of the Charter.

201. The representative of the United States did not suggest that the draft resolutions before us should be adopted by a two-thirds majority. He said that, under Article 18, paragraph 2, it is mandatory on the General Assembly to consider these draft resolutions as important. Since we have not, for the past 38 years, considered them important under Article 18, paragraph 2, I request you, Mr. President, to ask the Legal Counsel to clarify the matter.

202. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): It was, of course, the General Assembly, precisely, which called the attention of all of us to the question of what is or is not an important question and does or does not therefore require a two-thirds majority. It was the General Assembly which called our attention back to the provisions of the Charter, whether or not they had been invoked in recent years, and addressing the requirements of Article 18 makes perfectly clear that it is not in fact discretionary for this Assembly to decide whether or not recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security are or are not important questions, any more than the election of non-permanent members of the Security Council is or is not an important question. It is simply postulated by the Charter of the United Nations, under Article 18, paragraph 2, that these questions are important.

203. It is also perfectly clear—as even a cursory examination of the two draft resolutions before us establishes—that they concern in their very essence recommendations with respect to maintenance of international peace and security. A significant portion of their preambular and operative paragraphs is

concerned precisely with the maintenance of international peace and security.

204. Therefore, it seems to us that the mandatory decision must be that this is an important question.

205. Mr. **EL-FATTAL** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Actually, I was not surprised at the American proposal, which is twofold. I am speaking only of the interpretation—and I stress the word "interpretation"—this unilateral interpretation of the United States of the Charter of the United Nations. I am really surprised, because Mrs. Kirkpatrick herself did not consider the situation in the Golan Heights as a threat to peace. I can quote her statement on 5 February 1982 during the ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly, convened to discuss the question of the Golan Heights. After the United States had used its right of veto in the Security Council to paralyse that body, we came to the General Assembly to seek justice here.

206. At that time, Mrs. Kirkpatrick said that the draft resolution—the same resolution that has been submitted for the past three years:

> "The draft resolution . . . calls the Israeli legislation an act of aggression. But no shots were fired, no soldiers were brought into place. And the future of the Golan Heights is no less negotiable than before."[*] [*12th meeting, para. 21.*]

207. She herself thus recognizes that the situation, following the application of Israeli legislation in the occupied Syrian territories, does not constitute an act of aggression. Why should she now say that this question constitutes a threat to international peace and security or is relevant to international peace and security?

208. Moreover, mocking the draft resolution and wishing to minimize the importance of the question, Mrs. Kirkpatrick said:

> "Suppose this draft resolution is adopted, as regrettably I suppose it will be; what will this exercise have achieved?
>
> "—An Israeli withdrawal from the Golan? Of course not.
>
> "—An embargo on economic, technological and military goods destined for Israel? Of course not.
>
> "—A restoration of the occupied territories? Of course not.
>
> "—A resolution of the problems of Palestine? Of course not.
>
> "—Peace in the Middle East? Of course not."[*] [*Ibid., para. 28.*]

209. For three years we have been submitting the same draft resolution, this important resolution which we were forced to refer to the General Assembly for adoption because Israel has not yet rescinded the legislation and administration it imposed on the Golan Heights. For three years the United States did not make a move. The question, then, is political, in the following sense. The United States, through this attempt, wants to abort the draft resolution so as to allow Israel to shirk its international responsibility in the General Assembly. The General Assembly and the Security Council, by virtue of a unanimous decision, have called upon Israel to rescind its legislation and administration imposed on the Golan Heights. That has not happened. Therefore, there is an American-Israeli collusion to fetter the General Assembly and prevent it from following up the question. The Security Council has taken a decision on the question but has not been able to implement it owing to the United States veto. And now, under the pretext of the two-thirds majority, it comes to the General Assembly to impose something like a veto. But Mrs. Kirkpatrick does not have such a bloc in the General Assembly.

210. Let us be frank. This question must be seen in light of the strategic co-operation accords between the United States and Israel. This strategic co-operation includes the diplomatic field, that is, voting in the United Nations, and political and military questions.

211. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

212. Mrs. **KIRKPATRICK** (United States of America): Surely what is at stake here is not some representative's opinion of some speech which I made three years ago, on which occasion the General Assembly decided otherwise, I may say. The question is not my speech, the question is the clear provision of the Charter and the clear content of the draft resolutions before us.

213. A ruling from the Chair, a legal consultation, has been asked for by another Member State. The United States has no objection to such a consultation.

214. The **PRESIDENT**: Will the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic please continue?

215. Mr. **EL-FATTAL** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The question is not a legal question. That is what I wanted to say. It must be looked at from the angle of the strategic co-operation accord which, a few days before the annexation of the Golan Heights in 1981, was transformed into an alliance to include the military and economic fields, including military manoeuvres undertaken off Syrian shores—

216. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

217. Mrs. **KIRKPATRICK** (United States of America): The relationship between the United States and Israel is not germane to the point of order which has been raised here concerning the requirement for a two-thirds majority on matters dealing with international peace and security.

218. The **PRESIDENT**: Will the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic please continue?

219. Mr. **EL-FATTAL** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Now that we have done with the strategic aims of the United States, we shall move on to the legal aspects. I should like to pose a direct question to the United States delegation: Would we be in a better position today if Israel had abrogated its decision to impose its legislation and administration in the Golan Heights? If Israel had done so, we would not have needed this draft resolution, which is based on a bitter reality which our people suffer daily not only in the Golan Heights but also in Jerusalem and the occupied territories.

220. The question before us is defined in a draft resolution. We are not speaking about the eruption of a war tomorrow. We want to deter Israel, and here it is our right to put the draft resolution to the vote and the United States has no right to resort to the legal manoeuvres with which we are familiar. The United States has recourse to law only when it feels weak or

---

[*] Quoted in English by the speaker.

when it is faced by an adverse situation, the entire international community having condemned the annexation of the Golan Heights and Jerusalem and the *de facto* annexation that has occurred in the other occupied Arab territories. Therefore I see no value in the United States proposal and I reject it.

221. **The PRESIDENT**: In view of the nature of the question put to me by the representative of the United States, I shall request the Legal Counsel to provide us with an opinion on the subject.

222. I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

223. **Mr. SALAH** (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to comment on the point of order raised by the representative of the United States a moment ago. The General Assembly has discussed, ever since its inception, a great many resolutions—and many of them have been adopted—under the items entitled "The situation in the Middle East" and the "Question of Palestine". Among the most important of these is resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, by which the United Nations established Israel. This was adopted by a simple majority—no more than a few votes. I should like to ask whether the question of the United States representative applies retroactively to resolution 181 (II)?

224. **The PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of Democratic Yemen on a point of order.

225. **Mr. AL-ASHTAL** (Democratic Yemen): Mr. President, I heard you say that you have asked the Legal Counsel to give an opinion on the nature of the question posed by the United States representative. I beg to disagree with you, Sir, because it was I who asked for the legal opinion and the question I want to ask the Legal Counsel is whether, on the basis of precedent, Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter should apply to the question of the Middle East and whether it should therefore be regarded as an important question.

226. **The PRESIDENT**: I shall now ask the Legal Counsel to come and provide us with an opinion on the subject, as requested by the representative of Democratic Yemen.

227. **Mr. FLEISCHHAUER**, Legal Counsel: My advice has been requested with regard to the question whether draft resolution A/39/L.19 requires a two-thirds majority for adoption by the General Assembly, under Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

228. Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter provides:

> "Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, . . ."

and then a number of other points are mentioned.

229. It has been stated by the United States representative that draft resolution A/39/L.19 contains elements which make it a recommendation with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2.

230. Looking at draft resolution A/39/L.19, I note that in its third preambular paragraph it refers to a great number of Security Council resolutions. I also note that the draft resolution, in the tenth preambular paragraph, expresses grave concern: "at the continuing Israeli actions involving the escalation and expansion of the conflict in the region, which further violate the principles of international law and endanger international peace and security".

231. In the ninth and eleventh preambular paragraphs, the draft resolution speaks of the establishment of a "comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region" and "in the Middle East". The same reference is made in paragraphs 1, 3 and 4. In paragraph 8, aggression is condemned, and paragraph 10 speaks of the "aggressive and expansionist policies and practices" which "would have adverse effects on efforts for the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East and would threaten the security of the region". Paragraph 12 refers to the danger of nuclear blackmail.

232. I also note that the draft resolution refers—

233. **The PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of Democratic Yemen on a point of order.

234. **Mr. AL-ASHTAL** (Democratic Yemen): I think the Legal Counsel has started to speak on the substance of the draft resolution. My question was as follows: for 39 years the General Assembly has met and for 39 years there have been resolutions on the question of the Middle East. Not once has this been considered under Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations. How is it that now this question can be considered as mandatory in terms of Article 18, paragraph 2? That is my question.

235. **Mr. FLEISCHHAUER**, Legal Counsel: I was coming in a minute to what has just been stated by the representative of Democratic Yemen. I was saying that I also note that the draft resolution referred to a matter which is under active review by the Security Council. Now, the point has been made that the General Assembly had not at past sessions considered resolutions of this kind to fall under Article 18, paragraph 2. I would state that the practice of the General Assembly in this respect has been varied. Many of the resolutions relating to questions pertaining to the situation in the Middle East have received a two-thirds majority, so that the question of whether or not they were taken under Article 18, paragraph 2, has not arisen. In other cases, decisions have been taken that individual resolutions came under Article 18, paragraph 2.

236. I refer in this respect to a decision taken by the General Assembly in December 1961, at its sixteenth session [*1086th meeting*], on a draft resolution relating to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, which was held to require a two-thirds majority for adoption. Also, I refer to a decision taken in December 1978, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly [*84th meeting*], in connection with agenda item 125, concerning military and nuclear collaboration with Israel.

237. In addition, I would like to refer to the legal situation under which these procedural decisions are taken. They are taken individually by the General Assembly at each session on an *ad hoc* basis and they are not binding on the Assembly at subsequent sessions.

238. The point has been made that the draft resolution is not a specific resolution referring to maintenance of peace and security, but rather a general statement and general exhortation. It is true

that the draft resolution does not contain a recommendation to the Security Council to take measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. That, however, is not a prerequisite for the determination that a case falls under Article 18, paragraph 2.

239. Therefore, on the basis of what I have said before, I come to the conclusion that a finding would be appropriate that the decision on draft resolution A/39/L.19 falls into the category of decisions mentioned in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter and requires a two-thirds majority for adoption.

240. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): Purely from a legal and non-political—I assure my colleagues in this Assembly—point of view, it is very interesting to note that the Legal Counsel, in dealing with the past practice of the General Assembly, quoted two examples to us, one relating to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine from the Assembly's sixteenth session and the other dealing with nuclear and military collaboration with Israel from the thirty-third session. Yet, he did not tell us whether the two-thirds majority vote undertaken at those two sessions with respect to the two resolutions mentioned by him was undertaken on the basis of a specific request to do so. For if the two-thirds modality of voting on those two resolutions was made on the basis of a specific request, then, to my mind, one cannot take these two precedents as having fallen within what my colleague from the United States called the mandatory character of the language of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. For a provision of a mandatory character has to be applied in law without any specific request being made to that end.

241. That is point one and I require clarification from the Legal Counsel.

242. The second point, which is non-political, is again a legal point. The Legal Counsel, as I understood it, stated that each General Assembly decides individually, for its specific duration, the modality of voting on the nature of the issue before us. If this is so, how can we then employ the argument made by the United States representative to the effect that the proposal is based on Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter, being of a mandatory nature, for "mandatory nature", again, does not apply to an individual Assembly; in other words, it is not of an elective nature but of a durative nature applicable throughout in relation to all General Assemblies and to all items that have a connotation of "recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security".

243. The third legal point is this. A few days ago, on 11 December [*95th meeting*], we voted on a series of draft resolutions relating to the question of Palestine which included language akin to the language mentioned in the draft resolutions before us. If Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter is of a mandatory character, what is the status of the resolutions that were voted upon and adopted a few days ago? Indeed, from a legal point of view, what is the legal nature of the resolutions that were adopted during this session on the question of Afghanistan and a score of other resolutions that were adopted with language akin to the language in the draft resolutions before us?

244. I have one final remark which is not legal or political but is a factual remark. I am sure that, had it not been for the procedural wrangle that the General Assembly got itself into in the past two days with the ensuing results, we would not have faced the request that is made today by the representative of the United States and the interventions that it has generated. I feel that we should take stock from that experience in order not to be led to conclusions before we think ahead as to what is intended behind the language used in the Charter and we should not take that language lightly, action, as has been pointed out—and we have the words "international peace and security", which we assume mean "international peace and security" in the proposed draft resolution.

245. Mr. FLEISCHHAUER, Legal Counsel: First, I should like to say that of the two examples that I cited, one case is the case concerning the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine where there was no specific request, and one case is the case I quoted from the thirty-third session of the General Assembly where there was a specific request. In addition, I should like to say that even if one has a mandatory provision, then of course the question can legitimately be asked whether one is within the scope of the mandatory provision or not; and this, it seems to me, is precisely the question with which the General Assembly at this moment is confronted. This seems to be the situation in which the Assembly finds itself right now. Such questions can legitimately be asked, and I have stated that, according to my findings, we are in the realm of Article 18, paragraph 2, as far as draft resolution A/39/L.19 is concerned.

246. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I should like to express my profound and sincere gratitude and appreciation to the Legal Counsel for having provided me with the clarifications which I sought in my earlier intervention in relation to the questions on the precedents to which he had referred earlier.

247. Since, in regard to the two examples he has quoted, it is clear that in the one precedent the two-thirds majority vote modality was resorted to without a specific request being made, and since in the other example a specific request for a two-thirds majority requirement in the voting was made, it seems to me that on this score the precedents break about even. That is point one.

248. Secondly, in raising the legal questions to the Legal Counsel, I should like to assure him, you, Mr. President, my colleagues and the representative of the United States that I would not at all question the legitimacy and, indeed, the sovereign right of any Member State to make any motion on the basis of the Charter and on the basis of the rules of procedure. Indeed, it is through the democratic practices and the non-emotional and rational procedures we should adopt in our political stand in the United Nations that we could at least see a glimmer of hope for the attainment of international peace and security.

249. But when we consider a draft resolution in terms of the mandatory language in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter, when for 39 years the United Nations has been producing and adopting resolutions by following a practice contrary to the mandatory language of that paragraph, and when we require precedents and the precedents given are approximately evenly balanced, I can only submit that whether the mandatory language of Article 18, paragraph 2, applies to the draft resolution before us can be resolved only on the basis of a procedural vote. For if it is mandatory and must be applied

without resort to a procedural vote, we shall have concluded one of two things: either past resolutions with language similar to that of the draft resolution before us are null and void or we are now trying to institute a practice that runs counter to the 39 years of the General Assembly's practice. It seems to me that either alternative would be very dangerous for the future of the United Nations.

250. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States): I have listened with great interest to the intervention of my colleague and friend, the representative of Iraq. I would note only that, first, most resolutions brought before the General Assembly do not concern recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security or the election of members of the Security Council and so on, and, secondly, many of those resolutions have been adopted with a two-thirds majority, including, I believe, all those at this session that the representative of Iraq mentioned.

251. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I do not want to prolong the discussion because I do not think it serves the purposes and principles of the United Nations, but I would point out that the Legal Counsel referred to some paragraphs of draft resolution A/39/L.19, construing them to be in the nature of a recommendation relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. A recommendation relating to the maintenance of international peace and security must be action-oriented. When we say, in the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/39/L.19, "*Reaffirming further* the imperative necessity of establishing a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region, . . ." that is the expression of an aspiration. When we say, in the tenth preambular paragraph, "*Gravely concerned* . . . at the continuing Israeli actions involving the escalation and expansion of the conflict . . . " and so on, that is the expression of an opinion.

252. When it is said that there is a recommendation relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, I reply that we are not calling for peacekeeping operations, nor expending money, nor deciding upon a question that has been referred to us under the "Uniting for peace" resolution [*resolution 377 (V)*]. I know precisely what I am talking about. That is why we should note the conclusion of the Legal Counsel's opinion. He deems it to be appropriate. That is the expression of an opinion, but the opinion is consultative and non-binding.

253. I can see no other way to resolve the question whether draft resolution A/39/L.19 comes within the mandatory language of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter than by a procedural vote. In other words, we should not be deciding upon the additional categories; we are not adding an additional category. I want to make this precisely clear to my good friends from the United States. I am not relying on Article 18, paragraph 3. I am basing myself on a motion whether the mandatory language of paragraph 2—"recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security"—applies to the language of draft resolution A/39/L.19. We must decide that by a vote, in order to pass judgement on the legal opinion we have received from the Legal Counsel. That is the only democratic way to settle the question.

254. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

255. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I would point out only that the language of paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/39/L.19 is indeed such as to recommend. In it, the General Assembly

> "*Calls upon* all States to put an end to the flow to Israel of any military, economic and financial aid, as well as of human resources, aimed at encouraging it to pursue its aggressive policies against the Arab countries and the Palestinian people;".

It is precisely a recommendation.

256. Secondly, if the question whether the mandatory requirement of the Charter applies to a draft resolution that clearly contains recommendations concerning international peace and security is to be decided by majority vote of the Assembly, is the election of members of the Security Council to be decided first by a majority vote of the Assembly followed by a decision whether a two-thirds majority was required?

257. The PRESIDENT: There is clearly a sharp division of views on the question raised by the United States delegation. In these circumstances, I feel it would be appropriate for the Assembly itself to decide the issue, as it has done on several similar occasions in the past. The Assembly is master of its own procedures, and therefore it will decide on this matter. It will have to take a decision on the motion of the United States that the decision on draft resolution A/39/L.19 falls within the category of the decisions mentioned in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and that therefore its adoption requires a two-thirds majority of members present and voting.

258. I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

259. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): If this question is to be submitted to a vote by the General Assembly, to determine whether the draft resolutions constitute recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the United States would like to inquire what the sponsors of the draft resolutions concerned mean when they speak of "international peace and security". If they do not indeed mean to refer to international peace and security, what do their words mean? Surely we require a new translation of those draft resolutions.

260. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): I believe these draft resolutions are written in the English language and Mrs. Kirkpatrick reads English, being a professor. I do not think she should ask us to translate for her what these words mean.

261. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia): I think the situation before the Assembly is clear; asking for a vote on whether this needs a two-thirds majority or only a half is very clear.

262. We support a vote and we support very strongly this Assembly's voting in favour of voting on it as a normal, simple draft resolution, because if we are going to take every draft resolution to be a very important resolution the functioning of this body will be handicapped in the long run and we shall be setting a very wrong precedent. I think we should keep to the procedures that have been followed so far.

263. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): I must agree with the representative of Saudi Arabia. We think the situation is very clear. A very simple, clear question is

being raised here: is this or is this not an important matter—the whole debate on the Middle East and Palestine. We are hearing from representatives of the Arab Governments which time and again have taken a great deal of the time of the Assembly—by some estimates about a third of this session's time, certainly no less than a quarter, and similarly with previous sessions—on these very issues. I find it hard to believe that they have spent so much time on unimportant matters. The question indeed is, is this or is this not an important matter?

264. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We are facing a clear situation. The United States has asked that there should be put to the vote the question whether or not the draft resolution is one which needs a two-thirds majority and whether or not it is an important question. The representative of Iraq gave us an opinion which represents that of the Arab countries and the co-sponsors of the three draft resolutions. We support what the representative of Saudi Arabia said and we call for a vote on the United States motion in this connection.

265. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): I want to complete the point I was making earlier. Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter says that decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, and those questions shall include "recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security". We have both recommendations—by the way, recommendations of action, as has been pointed out—and we have the words "international peace and security", which we assume mean "international peace and security" in the proposed draft resolution.

266. If this is not an important question, I do not know what is, but I would say to the Arab representatives here who have raised this question, what have you been doing taking up a third of the Assembly's time on unimportant questions?

267. Mr. SCHIFTER (United States of America): I would just like to clarify the procedural state and make a recommendation.

268. We did not propose a motion: we made a statement as to our interpretation and what we believe to be the correct interpretation of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter as it applies to draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20. We note that the Legal Counsel has expressed his agreement with our interpretation. The matter could rest there.

269. However, as a vote has been asked for, and as it is necessary in the circumstances to have a proposal before the Assembly on which it can vote, and as you, Mr. President, suggested that there was a motion by the United States before the Assembly, let me simply, in a spirit of accommodation and so as to make it possible for us to have an appropriate text, read to the Assembly what we would indeed propose be put before this body. Here is my motion:

> "Draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 constitute 'recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security' within the meaning of that phrase as it appears in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and as affirmed by the Legal Counsel."

270. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has heard the motion of the United States.

271. I believe the representative of Iraq wants to speak on a point of order?

272. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I sincerely hope that the representative of the United States will not make that recommendation because it will amount, in effect, if that particular motion is rejected, to killing the draft resolutions *de facto*, and if it is accepted, to killing them *de jure*.

273. The question to be decided by the General Assembly, I submit in good faith, is the following—and this is my counter-proposal:

> "Whether the mandatory language in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter applies in the voting process on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20".

That is my proposal, whether the mandatory language in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter—

274. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

275. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The motion was, Sir, as you have pointed out clearly and as everyone present understands it, made by the United States. We made the motion prior to the motion of our friend from Iraq. The Assembly might desire to vote on both motions.

276. The PRESIDENT: I shall make the position clear when the representative of Iraq has finished. Will he proceed, please?

277. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I sincerely hope that my good friend, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, will listen carefully to what I am going to say now. It is a factual account of what has transpired this afternoon.

278. The delegation of the United States did not make a motion; it outlined a position to the effect that, in voting on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20, the voting modality should be two thirds because of the language in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter, which is mandatory, and we have to vote on these two draft resolutions on a two-thirds majority basis because the language of the Charter is mandatory.

279. It was the delegation of Democratic Yemen which requested legal opinion. The Legal Counsel gave his opinion. My delegation intervened twice and concluded that the only way to resolve this question is to put the question whether the mandatory nature applies here. I agree entirely with the delegation of the United States—and I have pointed this out many times—that the language of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter is mandatory. I said nothing short of that. But the question at issue here is whether the mandatory nature of that language and the conclusion in terms of the voting modality that issues from it apply to draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20. I am not here adopting a procedural tactic in connection with my motion and the United States motion being voted upon and as to which should take precedence over the other. The factual situation is this: the United States concluded, with the support of the Legal Counsel, that the language of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter is mandatory and therefore we have to have a two-thirds majority vote on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20.

280. My conclusion is that that has to be decided for the reasons I have outlined in my two statements. So what the Assembly has to do, in good faith and in all honesty, is to determine whether that mandatory language applies to the voting procedure on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20—not, as it was worded by the representative of the United States, that "draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 constitute

recommendations with respect" and so on. As I have said, if that motion, or recommendation, is accepted by the General Assembly, it will amount to killing the draft resolutions *de jure;* if it is rejected, it will kill them *de facto.*

281. Indeed, this shows the sense of fairness, justice and democracy and the discontinuance of abusive practices through procedural debates to which we should all aspire.

282. Mr. SCHIFTER (United States of America): This delegation certainly agrees with the final objectives just stated by the representative of Iraq, for whose scholarship we have the highest regard. Looking at this matter for what it is, namely, a legal issue, we consider it essential that the General Assembly deal with the steps that are necessary to reach the legal conclusion that has to be reached here, and not skip any step. If we were simply to put the question: should this matter be decided by a two-thirds vote or not, we would be skipping an essential legal point, namely, the question whether draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 are, as I suggested before, recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security. So as to deal with this question, we must go at it step by step, and going at it step by step would be to say, first, that draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 either are or are not recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security. If they are, then Article 18, paragraph 2, applies; if they are not, it does not apply. That is the question that has to be decided. The question that the General Assembly certainly should not be called upon to decide is whether, irrespective of whether the section applies or not, it wants to proceed by a two-thirds vote. This would not be legally proper and should not be a matter before the General Assembly at any time.

283. The PRESIDENT: I appeal to members of the General Assembly, including the delegation of the United States, to consider the following as the basis of a decision that is to be made by the General Assembly.

284. In the light of the discussion which has been held, it is my understanding that the General Assembly is being called upon to determine that draft resolution A/39/L.19 is to be decided by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting, under Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

285. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States, in all good faith and in the interests of clarity and the meaningfulness of our procedures here, respectfully suggests that the question as you have put it, Mr. President, would be perfectly acceptable to us providing that, after "draft resolution A/39/L.19", the words "as recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security" were added—so that it would read:

> "The General Assembly is being called upon to determine with regard to draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 that they should be decided by a two-thirds majority, under Article 18, paragraph 2, as recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security."

286. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The Tunisian delegation very much appreciates the effort made by the President of the Assembly, and we believe that his proposal is relevant and absolutely clear and that it could therefore be put to the vote immediately. That would resolve the situation in which the Assembly finds itself at present.

287. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The reason that the United States desires to make specific reference to "recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security" is that Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter includes a number of categories of decisions by the General Assembly. We desire to be specific about the precise terms of that Article under which we are suggesting that the Article applies. We are suggesting that it is precisely that part of Article 18, paragraph 2, concerning recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, and no other part of that Article, to which we are making reference.

288. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I crave your indulgence, Mr. President, but I was unable to take down in full the proposal you read out to the Assembly. I hope that you will read it again after my present statement so that I am able to scrutinize its wording.

289. What I was able to jot down makes specific reference to two things which link it precisely to the substance of the addition which the delegation of the United States would like to make to the proposal, that is, references to the requirement of a two-thirds majority in the voting, and to Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter. What troubles me, quite honestly, about the addition proposed by the United States is that with the United States addition to your proposal, Sir, we would end up with the precise proposal made by the United States earlier, except for the difference that, while the United States proposal starts by speaking of recommendations, the United States addition to your proposal would end by speaking of such recommendations.

290. That would somehow make it a little bit unfair, in terms of substance. The cardinal issue is, as I submitted earlier, that the position of the United States is that Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter applies to the voting procedure for draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 because its language is mandatory, and that the question has to be decided on the basis of Article 18, paragraph 2, not on the basis of the additional category on the basis of Article 18, paragraph 3. If that is the cardinal issue, why should we not be able to settle for the language put forward in an unprejudicial manner by you, Sir, which would not tip the scale either way.

291. As you pointed out earlier, according to the practice of the General Assembly there have always been requests, except in marginal cases where it is within the mandate that the voting should be by a two-thirds majority. I hope that your appeal will be heeded and that this question may be disposed of.

292. I would note that we are not deciding here whether or not the question is important linguistically or politically or geographically; we are deciding here the technical, conceptual, constitutional question of whether or not what is contained in draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 is governed by the mandatory nature of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

293. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States made a simple point about draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20. That point was that those draft resolutions concern recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and that, that being the case, they fall under

the mandatory provisions of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter, which deal with recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security.

294. The position stated by the United States on a point of order was upheld by the Legal Counsel with regard to draft resolution A/39/L.19. The United States was the first country to formulate a motion here today, once the President determined that he would call for a vote. The United States feels that it cannot accept a formulation which makes no reference to precisely the point of our point of order, namely, whether these draft resolutions, making recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, should not fall under that Article. To eliminate reference to the subject-matter of our point of order seems to me to be unreasonable and unacceptable.

295. The **PRESIDENT**: I propose now to suspend the meeting for a short time.

The meeting was suspended at 7.10 p.m. and resumed at 8.35 p.m.

296. The **PRESIDENT**: Before the suspension there was a motion by the representative of the United States, which reads as follows:

> "Draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20 constitute 'recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security' within the meaning of that phrase as it appears in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and as affirmed by the Legal Counsel."

297. The Assembly will now take a decision on the United States motion.

The motion was rejected by 69 votes to 28, with 23 abstentions.

298. The **PRESIDENT**: The General Assembly will now vote on the various draft resolutions before it. First, we turn to draft resolution A/39/L.19 and Corr.1 and Add.1. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 10 of that draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Greece, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 69 votes to 39, with 26 abstentions.

299. The **PRESIDENT**: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/39/L.19 and Corr.1 and Add.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Burma, Chile, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 100 votes to 16, with 28 abstentions (resolution 39/146 A).

300. The **PRESIDENT**: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/39/L.20 and Corr.1 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The draft resolution was adopted by 88 votes to 22, with 32 abstentions (resolution 39/146 B).

301. The **PRESIDENT**: We turn now to draft resolution A/39/L.21 and Corr.1 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Paraguay, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United States of America, Venezuela.

The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/146 C).

302. The **PRESIDENT**: I shall now call upon those representatives wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

303. Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines): The Philippines has consistently stressed the view that a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict should be achieved on the basis of the following key principles: first, withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem; secondly, recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to establish an independent State in Palestine; thirdly, participation of the Palestinian people, through the PLO, in the peace negotiations; and fourthly, recognition of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force, in conformity with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

304. We also remain of the view that resolutions on the situation in the Middle East, in order that they may contribute positively to the peace efforts, should be balanced in substance and should not prejudice the sovereign right of States to conduct their own international affairs in the way they see fit.

305. In the light of the foregoing, my delegation was constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/39/L.20. By the same token, while my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.19, we have reservations on the way certain of its provisions were formulated.

306. Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria's position on the item under discussion is well known and has been consistent over the years. It has found clear expression in our contribution to the debate on this agenda item. It should therefore be evident to all that we fully share the concern expressed in the draft resolutions relating to the situation in the Middle East, and we agree with most of their elements.

307. There are however a number of provisions in these texts which we cannot support. In particular, Austria does not believe that breaking relations with Israel would bring us any closer to a solution of the Middle East problem. We also consistently oppose the singling out for criticism in General Assembly resolutions of particular countries, a practice which does not serve to promote the cause of peace in the Middle East.

308. Nor can we support any formulation which could be interpreted as impinging on the principle of universality of membership in the United Nations.

309. While Austria whole-heartedly supported draft resolution A/39/L.21, in the light of these considerations it felt obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20.

310. Let me add a few words explaining our position on the procedural motion regarding the application of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations in the vote on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20. My delegation is concerned about the recent trend at this session of the General

Assembly to change the established practice of decision-making to suit particular political interests and positions. As we fear that this tendency could undermine the role and the functioning of this body, we felt compelled to oppose this motion, just as we have previously opposed others.

311. Mr. BORIO (Brazil): With regard to draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20, let me reiterate that the Brazilian Government believes that the global solution for the situation in the Middle East must necessarily include the right of all States in the region to exist within internationally recognized boundaries. My delegation has been insisting on the withdrawal of the occupation forces from Arab territories and on the right of the Palestinians to an autonomous and independent territory. But it also considers that the possibilities for achieving such a goal should not be reduced by the diplomatic isolation of one of the parties to the conflict, even if that party has been acting in a manner incompatible with international law and with numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We strongly condemn such behaviour, but at the same time do not want to offer the Israeli Government excuses to act in further disregard of the rules of international law and of mutually respectful relationships among peoples because of its isolation from the international community. It is necessary for Israel to understand that its attitude does not lead to peace or to its own security. No action—and in particular no illegal action—will give Israel the right to live in peace if it does not respect the security and territorial integrity of its neighbours.

312. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): The Albanian delegation voted in favour of the three draft resolutions just adopted. This is in conformity with the position of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania in support of the struggle of Arab peoples against the imperialist, Zionist aggression.

313. The Albanian delegation expressed once again the viewpoints of its Government in the statement made during the debate on this agenda item [*75th meeting*]. Nevertheless, we have our reservations; we have made them known in the past and we shall not repeat them now. They deal with some paragraphs, such as paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/39/L.19, as well as with the documents and resolutions adopted in the past which are now mentioned in the draft resolutions just adopted.

314. Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt): The principled position of Egypt regarding the illegality of the Israeli occupation and annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights is reflected in no uncertain terms in our sponsoring of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.27, adopted by the Special Political Committee on 29 November and endorsed today by the General Assembly [*resolution 39/95F*]. It is equally reflected in our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/39/L.19 just adopted, particularly paragraph 9, which focuses on the Syrian Golan Heights.

315. During the ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly, the delegation of Egypt, on 5 February 1982, stated fully its position on the issue of the Golan Heights [*12th meeting*], and I need not quote from that statement.

316. As to draft resolution A/39/L.20, just adopted, it includes, in our view, both in its preambular and operative paragraphs, positive elements and established principles to which Egypt fully subscribes. The Government of Egypt strongly supports the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war. We likewise reaffirm the applicability of the Geneva conventions to all the occupied Arab territories in the West Bank, including Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, and the occupied Syrian Golan Heights.

317. It is also our view that Israel's decision to extend its law, administration and jurisdiction over the Golan Heights is null and void and that Israel must withdraw from the occupied Golan Heights. There are certain aspects of draft resolution A/39/L.20 to which we cannot subscribe, in particular some parts of paragraph 13. We have therefore abstained in the voting on that resolution.

318. Mrs. BOCCHECIAMPE de CROVATI (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Our country is participating, as it always does, in the Assembly's consideration of the situation in the Middle East. We are thereby performing a duty that we owe to the international community, for we feel that there should be a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

319. We are convinced that such a peace in the region will be achieved only if it is founded upon the right of all States in the region to exist in peace within internationally recognized and secure borders, and as long as there is full respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. That is our unwavering position, which is well known.

320. In that spirit, Venezuela abstained in the voting on draft resolutions A/39/L.19, L.20 and L.21. We did so because we consider that they contain paragraphs that do not contribute to the achievement of the objective of peace. Rather than promoting the processes that have been favoured by the international community, they include points that could indeed cause a delay in the settlement of the Middle East problem.

321. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation concurs with the Secretary-General's statement, with regard to the conflict between the Arab countries and Israel, that "a comprehensive settlement will have to be reached, at least in its final stage, if not earlier, through a process of negotiation in which all the parties concerned will participate" [*A/39/600, para. 39*]; that "none of the parties to this historic and tragic conflict can hope to attain its maximum demands if there is to be a state of real peace in the region" [*ibid., para. 43*]; and that

> "a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East will have to meet the following conditions: the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from occupied territories; respect of and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force; and, lastly, a just settlement of the Palestinian problem based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including self-determination. In this context, the question of Jerusalem also remains of primary importance." [*Ibid., para. 38.*]

322. In previous years, Honduras cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolutions that today correspond to draft resolution A/39/L.21. We have continued to follow the same policy during this session. Regarding draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20, my delegation finds positive and negative elements in them, and we have already expressed the position of

Honduras within the context of our bilateral and multilateral international relations.

323. We have already indicated, *inter alia*, the reasoning underlying our votes on previous resolutions. We support the legitimate and inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, the right to existence and security of all States in the Middle East, including Israel, and the preservation of the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem. That is why we have also spoken out against the use of force in international relations and condemned any act of military occupation. Everything that is in accordance with those aspects in these resolutions we deem to be positive and, therefore, has our continued support.

324. However, there are negative elements that have been merged with the positive elements. The delegation of Honduras has previously expressed its clear-cut position. There are some elements here that do not give the necessary respect to the consular and diplomatic relations we enjoy with other States of the international community, as well as to the harmonization of efforts that we must make in order to achieve the aims sought by all of the 159 Members of the United Nations.

325. Honduras does not consider the singling out of countries a justifiable practice, and it would be difficult for us to support appeals and selective measures that would be incompatible with the relations and aims we have mentioned. This is a matter of principle which, if not taken into consideration, could in our view jeopardize the security, confidence and good faith that should govern consular and diplomatic relations among States and could have a negative impact on the achievement of the aims of the United Nations, which can be achieved by promoting the peaceful solution of disputes and peaceful forms of co-operation among States Members of the Organization.

326. In view of the concurrence of the negative and positive elements I have just mentioned, we abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/39/L.19 and L.20.

327. Mr. PAPADOPOULOS (Greece): Greece has never failed to condemn consistently and in no uncertain terms the acts of Israel against the Arab countries. Our position in this respect is determined, *inter alia*, by my country's unshakeable attachment to the principles enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations and in the Helsinki Final Act.[7] It is for those reasons that my delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.19, L.20 and L.21.

328. However, my delegation is unable to go along with certain paragraphs in draft resolution A/39/L.20. If a separate vote had been taken, my delegation would have abstained in the voting on paragraphs 8, 13 (*c*) and 13 (*d*) and would have voted against paragraph 14. Thus, my delegation dissociates itself from those paragraphs, while it voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

329. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Australia voted in favour of the United States motion on the basis of the opinion of the Legal Counsel and of our own reading of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations. But my delegation is concerned, as I said yesterday in relation to the resolutions with regard to *apartheid* [*99th meeting*], that established procedures of the Assembly are being changed, with unpredictable consequences.

330. Australia voted against two of the three draft resolutions which have been adopted because they contain some extreme language and unacceptable elements which are contrary to Australian policy. Australia supports the urgent need to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. The Palestinian issue is of central importance to a settlement, and Australia acknowledges the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including their right, if they so choose, to independence and the possibility of their own independent State.

331. At the same time, Australia has a fundamental commitment to Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. Draft resolution A/39/L.19 failed to provide appropriate guarantees of that. In our view, it should, for example, have reaffirmed Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as essential elements in a framework for a settlement. We could not support draft resolution A/39/L.19 because of its exclusive emphasis on the rights of one party to the conflict to the detriment of the rights of another.

332. Australia also rejects a number of elements in draft resolution A/39/L.20 which would, in our view, serve only to aggravate an already tense situation and obstruct the search for peace. In particular, we cannot support calls for the adoption of measures which would lead to the total isolation of Israel, including action under Chapter VII of the Charter. Such calls take no account of the need for all parties to commit themselves to end the violence and bloodshed which have so long marked the dispute and to seek negotiated solutions.

333. Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.21. The Australian Government does not accept the validity of measures which claim to change the status of territories occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights.

334. Mrs. CARRASCO MONJE (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Government of Bolivia has always firmly supported the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force. For this reason, we consider null and void measures adopted by Israel with regard to the occupied Arab territories, and we call for the withdrawal of the occupying troops in Lebanon and the Golan Heights, as well as withdrawal from the territories occupied in the West Bank and Gaza.

335. My delegation considers that a just and lasting settlement of the question of the Middle East must be achieved that will allow all the States in the region to live together in peace within secure and recognized borders free from any threat. However, the approach and treatment in some of the paragraphs of draft resolution A/39/L.20 made it impossible for us to support it.

336. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): The Norwegian delegation has voted against two and in favour of one of the draft resolutions before us on the situation in the Middle East. In this connection, I would like to stress the following points which remain at the core of my country's position on the Middle East issue.

337. First, Norway firmly believes that the basic elements of a peaceful settlement to the Arab-Israeli dispute are contained in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). These elements, which are recognized by the international community,

include the non-acceptance of the acquisition of territory by force and the right of all States in the area to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

338. Equally, we believe that a just, lasting and comprehensive peace must take into account the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination.

339. Those basic principles strike what in our view is a fair balance of rights and obligations between the parties to the dispute.

340. I would like to stress that two of the draft resolutions before us, taken as a whole, in no way reflect the mutual balance between the interests of the parties which, in the opinion of my Government, would be necessary to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

341. Rather than promoting peace and understanding, the contents of some of the paragraphs of draft resolution A/39/L.20 are disruptive and could lead in the opposite direction. With regard to paragraphs 12 to 16 of that draft resolution, our objections relate to their substantive contents as well as to the fact that they cannot be reconciled with the division of responsibilities between the General Assembly and the Security Council as envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations.

342. Norway also voted against draft resolution A/39/L.19. Our main objection is the severe lack of balance. Regarding paragraph 10 of that draft resolution, we believe that a sovereign State has the right to conclude agreements with another State. That right is recognized by international law.

343. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.21, concerning Jerusalem. Norway does not recognize Israel's annexation of Jerusalem, and we do not recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

344. Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.19 because it reflects my country's position and the will of the vast majority of the international community, and of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in particular, that there be a comprehensive, just, peaceful and lasting solution in the Middle East that will meet the legitimate aspirations of all the peoples of the region.

345. At the same time, my delegation would like to reaffirm its belief that the situation in the Middle East, an area of persistent instability, requires a just and equitable solution based on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

346. Notwithstanding that, the delegation of Argentina wishes to state that it does have some reservations with regard to some of the paragraphs in the draft resolution and the possible interpretation that might be given them, in particular, paragraph 10, upon which a separate vote was taken, and paragraphs 6 and 11, because they contain statements critical of efforts made to achieve peace in the region.

347. The Argentine delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.20 because some of its paragraphs contain judgements and recommendations that would not, in our opinion, lead to a peaceful, negotiated and comprehensive solution of the situation in the Middle East.

348. On the other hand, my delegation believes that, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter, the competence of the main organs of the United Nations must be respected. Nevertheless, my delegation expresses its full support for the paragraphs in the resolution that refer to the Syrian territory of the Golan Heights, which Israel continues to occupy illegally, in violation of Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

349. Israel's decision to impose its legislation, jurisdiction and administration in the Golan Heights is null and void, and therefore has no validity or legal effect whatever. A part of the Syrian Arab Republic's sovereign territory has been illegally taken away from it. The Government of Israel must respect the principles of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and of the territorial integrity of States, which are essential principles laid down in the Charter.

350. Mr. CHEN CHARPENTIER (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mexico has repeatedly stated that it is in favour of a peaceful, negotiated solution to the Middle East conflict, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

351. Any just and lasting settlement must take into account the interests of all the parties involved and must fulfil the national aspirations of the Palestinian people. So long as that core of the conflict is not resolved, there will be only provisional agreements that will impede any lasting solution.

352. The convening of an international conference, with the participation of all the interested parties and under the auspices of the United Nations, could be of great importance for peace, so long as, from the very stage of its preparation, the true political will to find satisfactory compromise formulas existed.

353. Mexico voted in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.19, L.20 and L.21, thereby demonstrating once again its real commitment to United Nations resolutions, despite its reservations on paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of draft resolution A/39/L.20. Finally, had there been a separate vote on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/39/L.19, my delegation would have abstained.

354. Mr. DOJE (Bhutan): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/39/L.20. My delegation voted in favour of that draft resolution, but we have reservations on the use of certain phrases and on certain determinations made in the eighth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 12.

355. Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): The Government of Togo has always been very much concerned over the situation in the Middle East and has always wished peace to be restored to that part of the world, which for almost 40 years has never known that peace so greatly aspired to by all the peoples of the region. That is why my delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.19, L.20 and L.21.

356. The Government of Togo has always supported various actions designed to restore peace to the region, by means, of course, of the self-determination of the Palestinian people. However, the Government of Togo refuses, as it has the right to do, to take a

position on agreements freely signed by sovereign States. My Government does not defend agreements to which it is not a party, but neither does it wish to attack such agreements. That is why my delegation abstained in the vote on paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/39/L.19.

357. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

358. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I have two brief remarks. The first relates to the voting sheet that I have before me concerning the United States motion to regard international peace and security as international peace and security. I think this is a historic document. We have long argued that there is, as many people know, an abasement and a corruption of language here. We have seen that argument used in Orwell's book *1984*—this very year. What Mr. Orwell was saying was that in 1984 the word "peace" would not mean peace; it would mean something else—it might mean war. What we have learned today is that the General Assembly says that "international peace and security" does not mean international peace and security. I think that, at the close of December of 1984, this is, unhappily, a fitting tribute to Mr. Orwell.

359. My second comment is this. The vote of the General Assembly on the motion regarding Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations has decreed that the issue at hand, the situation in the Middle East, with all the attendant resolutions condemning my country, is not—I repeat: is not—an important issue. My Government will in the future take this into account.

360. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

361. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan): I did not think that we were now discussing the vote which took place a while ago. The representative of Israel asked to explain his delegation's vote on the draft resolutions that have just been adopted. Now he has simply opened the debate on another issue, a substantive issue. He is interpreting the meaning of a vote. The General Assembly did not debate that vote. No delegation asked to speak in order to debate the motion put forward by the representative of the United States.

362. So I instruct you, Mr. President, to ask the representative of Israel to limit his statement to explaining his delegation's position on the motion and not to interpret what the Assembly meant when it voted on the motion.

363. The **PRESIDENT**: Unfortunately, the representative of Israel has already left the Hall, so I cannot tell him anything. The Assembly has concluded its consideration of agenda item 36.

The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Third Committee*, 71st meeting, and *ibid., Third Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

[2] Resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex.

[3] This statement was made at the 66th meeting of the Third Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form (see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-ninth Session, Third Committee*, 66th meeting, and *ibid., Third Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

[4] The delegations of Guinea-Bissau and Zimbabwe subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution and the delegation of Peru that it had intended to abstain.

[5] The delegation of Guinea-Bissau subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[6] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

[7] Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975.

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

102nd
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 17 December 1984,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA
(Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 3

Credentials of representatives to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly (*concluded*):*

(*a*) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee;

(*b*) Report of the Credentials Committee

1. The PRESIDENT: I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 13 of its second report [*A/39/574/Add.1*]. The Credentials Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/3 B).

AGENDA ITEM 53

Israeli nuclear armament: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 55

Relationship between disarmament and development: report of the Disarmament Commission

AGENDA ITEM 59

Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session:

(*a*) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

(*b*) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*c*) Status of multilateral disarmament agreements: report of the Secretary-General;

(*d*) Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*e*) Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*f*) Prevention of nuclear war: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*g*) Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session:

  (i) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

  (ii) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*h*) Unilateral nuclear disarmament measures: report of the Secretary-General;

(*i*) Comprehensive programme of disarmament: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*j*) Disarmament Week: report of the Secretary-General;

(*k*) Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations;

(*l*) Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies:

  (i) Work of the Advisory Board: report of the Secretary-General;

  (ii) Draft statute of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

AGENDA ITEM 62

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean

---

*Resumed from the 32nd meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 63

World Disarmament Conference: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference

AGENDA ITEM 65

General and complete disarmament:

(*a*) Study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Military research and development: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Study on conventional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;

(*d*) Measures to provide objective information on military capabilities: report of the Secretary-General;

(*e*) Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*f*) Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes: report of the Conference on Disarmament;

(*g*) Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans: report of the Secretary-General;

(*h*) Contribution of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 66

Question of Antarctica: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 67

Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 68

Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security:

(*a*) Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Security Council;

(*b*) Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 69

Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations

AGENDA ITEM 143

Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States

2. Mr. KESSELY (Chad), Rapporteur of the First Committee (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on its work under item 66, on Antarctica, and on the questions of international security, under items 67, 68, 69 and 143 of the agenda. They are contained in documents A/39/756 to 759 and 761.

3. The First Committee considered the question of the Antarctic from 28 to 30 November and adopted a draft resolution. This is a very complex and sensitive subject because of the interests involved. Nevertheless, the general debate on this item demonstrated once again the peaceful and universal character of that continent. Delegations which spoke in the discussion all reaffirmed that Antarctica must be free from the arms race and from political rivalries. They renounced all claim to ownership and any territorial claims. On the other hand, international co-operation in the area of scientific research, peaceful exploitation of the resources and protection of the environment were stressed by many delegations.

4. The report of the Secretary-General [*A/39/583 (Part I) and Corr.1 and A/39/583 (Part II) and Corr.1, vol. I to III*] prepared in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/77, was widely appreciated, and this appreciation is expressed in the draft resolution adopted on this item.

5. I submit to the General Assembly for adoption the recommendation of the First Committee found in paragraph 7 of the report [*A/39/756*].

6. Regarding the questions of international security, the Committee considered the items under this heading from 3 to 7 December 1984. The exchange of views occurred in a climate of relative détente, perhaps because international security had not been spectacularly challenged this year or because there has been a beginning of a softening of the relations between the two major Powers, and perhaps also through lassitude, because we have come to regard existing sources of tension as part of our daily lives. Nevertheless, these points of tension were not neglected. On the contrary, they served as specific examples on which to base denunciations of the lack

of international security and a call for scrupulous respect for the Charter to counter-balance it.

7. Item 67, entitled "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region", is, as representatives know, of particular importance for the region involved. Its consideration demonstrated that the promotion of peace, security and co-operation in the area would also make a significant contribution to the peace and security of all nations.

8. Items 68 and 69, entitled, respectively, "Review and implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" and "Implementation of the provisions of collective security of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security", gave delegations an opportunity to express their views regarding various aspects of peace and security in all parts of the world.

9. Finally, item 143, entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States", appeared this year for the first time on the General Assembly's agenda, at the request of the Soviet Union, and was allocated to the First Committee for consideration. The underlying motive for the inclusion of this item was that, in the light of the frequent action to undermine the régimes of other States, the General Assembly should be much firmer in condemning such practices and should also, as a corollary to this, call upon all States to respect and strictly observe the right of peoples freely to choose their socio-political system and to pursue their political, economic, social and cultural development in complete independence.

10. Once again the First Committee sincerely believes that it has done something to try and unite the forces of the world for the maintenance of international peace and security, in order to spare mankind from the scourge of war. That is why in its various decisions it has stressed the need for effective, energetic and flexible measures to avert or eliminate threats to or breaches of the peace.

11. On behalf of the First Committee, I have pleasure in submitting to the General Assembly for adoption the recommendations contained in the final paragraph of each report.

12. Before concluding, I should like to come back to one of the disarmament items which has already been introduced, that is, item 55, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.72/Rev.1, which was adopted by the First Committee, have made known their wish that the session of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development should be held at Geneva. That request was formulated after appropriate consultations with the delegations concerned in the First Committee. Consequently, I submit this request to the General Assembly and ask it to take note of it.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.

13. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that:

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

I also remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

14. We now come to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 53 [*A/39/743*]. The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The programme budget implications of the draft resolution are in document A/39/806. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on paragraphs 3 and 4. We shall vote first on paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Zaire.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 78 votes to 23, with 27 abstentions.[1]

15. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on paragraph 4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Zaire.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 70 votes to 26, with 32 abstentions.[1]

16. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 94 votes to 2, with 44 abstentions (resolution 39/147).[2]

17. The PRESIDENT: I understand that some technical points still need to be clarified with regard to item 55, "Relationship between disarmament and development", and I therefore suggest we defer consideration of that item until later this morning.

18. The Assembly will now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 59 [*A/39/749*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the 18 draft resolutions and the one draft decision recommended by the First Committee in paragraphs 67 and 68 of its report. Draft resolution A relates to unilateral nuclear disarmament measures. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 126 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions (resolution 39/148 A).[3]

19. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution B, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cape Verde, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Suriname, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 98 votes to 16, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/148 B).[3]

20. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C relates to nuclear weapons in all aspects. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Chad, Dominican Republic, Gambia, Honduras, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Niger, Paraguay, Senegal, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 102 votes to 19, with 13 abstentions (resolution 39/148 C).

21. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D deals with the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Uruguay, Zaire.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 101 votes to 19, with 17 abstentions. (resolution 39/148 D).

22. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E deals with the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab

Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 71 votes to 11 with 53 abstentions (resolution 39/148 E).

23. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Climatic effects of nuclear war: nuclear winter". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Colombia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution F was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 39/148 F).[3]

24. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution G relates to bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Malawi, Mongolia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 100 votes to 12, with 26 abstentions (resolution 39/148 G).[4]

25. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H concerns the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 2 of draft resolution H. If I hear no objection I shall put that paragraph to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [illegible] Nam.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 114 votes to 3, [illegible] 20 abstentions.

26. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution H as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Haiti, Israel, Japan.

Draft resolution H, as a whole, was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions (resolution 39/148 H).[3]

27. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I is entitled "Comprehensive programme of disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/148 I).

28. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution J, "Disarmament Week".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution J was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 19 abstentions (resolution 39/148 J).[3]

29. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution K concerns a cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Denmark, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Spain.

Draft resolution K was adopted by 124 votes to 13, with 9 abstentions (resolution 39/148 K).[3]

30. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution L is entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/807. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal,[5] Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Ethiopia, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution L was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 18 abstentions (resolution 39/148 L).[5]

31. The PRESIDENT: Now we turn to draft resolution M, which concerns international co-operation for disarmament. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil,[6] Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Paraguay, Sweden.

Draft resolution M was adopted by 109 votes to 19, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/148 M).[7]

32. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution N concerns the report of the Conference on Disarmament. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Nepal,[8] Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution N was adopted by 123 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions (resolution 39/148 N).[8]

33. The PRESIDENT: Next we come to draft resolution O, which deals with the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph. If there is no objection, I shall therefore put it to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 117 votes to 19.

34. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution O, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon,[9] Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba. Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution O, as a whole, was adopted by 127 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/148 O).[3]

35. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution P relates to the prevention of nuclear war. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey.

Draft resolution P was adopted by 128 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/148 P).

36. The PRESIDENT: Next we come to draft resolution Q dealing with the "Review of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade". The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution Q was adopted (resolution 39/148 Q).

37. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution R is entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution R was adopted (resolution 39/148 R).

38. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to the draft decision contained in paragraph 68 of the report of the First Committee. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft decision is contained in document A/39/795. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

The draft decision was adopted by 145 votes to 1 (decision 39/423).

39. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

40. Mr. PEREZ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution H, entitled "United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research". However, we want to state for the record that the adoption of that draft resolution should not constitute a precedent to be applied to other organs and institutes which also work on the basis of voluntary contributions. This applies in particular to the provisions concerning the financing of certain activities of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research from the United Nations budget.

41. Mr. BAY ROSSI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation abstained in the vote in the First Committee on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.64 regarding the prevention of nuclear war. The conclusion which can be derived from the discussion in the First Committee on this item during the present session, including draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40, clearly brings out the need for a more detailed study of this. The prevention of nuclear war is undoubtedly a matter which is of paramount importance for all countries. It is even a tragic choice in the case of many countries, including Italy. We believe therefore that a global approach to the problem would be the most likely to lead to more specific results than certain unilateral initiatives whose conclusions are often premature. It is for that reason that my delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.64.

42. Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like very briefly to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations" just adopted.

43. When that draft resolution was voted on in the First Committee my delegation abstained. We did so because differences of opinion exist between the United States and the Soviet Union as to how to resume their negotiations. As we explained then, this position does not mean that we do not agree to the resumption of talks between them; on the contrary, we sincerely hope that they will respond to the wishes of the peoples of the world by endeavouring to arrive at an early resumption of their talks.

44. Recently the Soviet Union and the United States agreed to carry out negotiations on outer space and nuclear weapons. We welcome that development, and just now we voted in favour of the draft resolution. We sincerely hope they will engage in earnest negotiations and arrive at early agreement conducive to the relaxation of international tensions, without causing any harm to the interests of any other country.

45. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 62 [*A/39/752*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/801/Rev.1. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/149).

46. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 63 [*A/39/753*]. The draft resolution recommended by the Committee is contained in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/795. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/150).

47. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 65 [*A/39/755*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the 10 draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 29 of its report. Draft resolution A is entitled "Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Mexico, Mozambique, Panama, Venezuela.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 39/151 A).[10]

48. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/39/795. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: India, United States of America.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 143 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 39/151 B).[11]

49. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to draft resolution C, which deals with the study on conventional disarmament. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution C?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 39/151 C).

50. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution D, "Nuclear-weapon freeze". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Chad, China, Costa Rica,[12] Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Paraguay, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 104 votes to 18, with 18 abstentions (resolution 39/151 D).[13]

51. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E concerns the contribution of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saudi Arabia,[14] Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, China, Denmark, Djibouti, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Liberia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 109 votes to 18, with 14 abstentions (resolution 39/151 E).

52. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution F, entitled "Military research and development". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/39/795. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Turkey.

Draft resolution F was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/151 F).

53. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution G concerns a review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The First Committee adopted draft resolution G without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution G was adopted (resolution 39/151 G).

54. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H deals with the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, China, France, India, Mozambique, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution H was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 39/151 H).

55. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I is entitled "Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Uruguay, Zaire.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 70 votes to 19, with 53 abstentions (resolution 39/151 I).

56. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft resolution J, which is entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". The First Committee adopted draft resolution J without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution J was adopted (resolution 39/151 J).

57. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 66 [*A/39/756*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/152).

58. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 67 [*A/39/757*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/153).

59. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 68 [*A/39/758*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the four draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 16 of its report. Draft resolution I is entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/154).

60. The PRESIDENT: We next turn to draft resolution II, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 39/155).

61. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Strengthening of international security: common security". The First Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/156).

62. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution IV, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 28 abstentions (resolution 39/157).

63. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will next turn its attention to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 69 [*A/39/759*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is in document A/39/786. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Viet Nam.

The draft resolution was adopted by 108 votes to 22, with 13 abstentions (resolution 39/158).

64. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Albania, who wishes to explain his vote.

65. Mr. JANKU (Albania): As at the last session, this time too the Albanian delegation did not participate in the voting on the draft resolutions related to international peace and security recommended by the First Committee in its reports contained in documents A/39/758 and A/39/759. This was because of the reservations we have on some formulations and views expressed in those draft resolutions. Since we have already explained those reservations

on previous occasions, we are not entering into the details now.

66. However, we would like to reiterate that these resolutions do not reveal the causes of the insecurity prevailing the world over. We maintain the view that it is the super-Powers, other imperialist Powers and reactionary forces which threaten and undermine international peace and security.

67. At the same time we wish to say that the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution on the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region in document A/39/757 shows quite clearly the wish of the Mediterranean and other countries that peace and security should prevail in this region of particular importance. Our country has always shared the concern and aspirations of these countries that the Mediterranean should belong to the people of the Mediterranean; this position of ours was clearly expressed in our speech on this problem in the First Committee.

68. However, we wish to reiterate that we have reservations about this resolution. We would like to point out that the Mediterranean and its security, like peace in general, are threatened by the super-Powers, which are responsible for the increasing tension prevailing in this region and for the tense and continuously worsening situation. Our delegation has its reservations, particularly with regard to the reference in the resolution to the Mediterranean chapter of the Helsinki Final Act and some other paragraphs. Our position on the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is well known and is unchangeable.

69. As we have already stressed in our statements both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee, the Socialist People's Republic of Albania and its Government maintain that only when the super-Powers, together with their aggressive fleets and other military equipment, leave these waters will the Mediterranean really belong to the peoples of the Mediterranean and will genuine peace and security prevail in the region.

70. The PRESIDENT: Finally, the Assembly will turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 143 [*A/39/761*]. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 12 of the report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

The draft resolution was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 30 abstentions (resolution 39/159).

71. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

72. Mr. HERRERA CACERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in document A/39/761 refers to certain actions that are described as State terrorism and aimed at undermining the socio-political system of other sovereign States.

73. None the less, it is known that in contemporary international law there is no autonomous concept of terrorism and, if the internal law of different States shows the existence of regulations on this, comparative study shows that the meaning differs. If we have not, at the international level, defined the basic concept of terrorism, how is it possible to describe unlawful actions or sets of actions as a type of terrorism the illegality of which is a consequence of violations of internationally established laws and principles, and not a consequence of innovative concepts which have no internationally accepted legal basis? In other words, we do not yet have an international classification of terrorism, nor do we have a classification of its forms, whether individual or State terrorism; nor in the latter case, terrorism of a State against its own nationals or against other sovereign States.

74. The very formulation of terrorism offers major difficulties, since this is an area where subjective approaches predominate that can be a source of arbitrary interpretation and can lead the developing States, in particular, to take part in the East-West conflict.

75. The guidelines of contemporary international law, including the resolutions of this international Organization, are sufficiently explicit to prevent our hastily treading on uncertain and dangerous ground for the effective implementation of the principles of the Charter and its respective resolutions.

76. Amendments introduced to the draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism or any action by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system of other sovereign States have the advantage of attenuating the subjectivity of the original text, thereby expanding the list of illicit actions that might be carried out by a Government against another Government, for political or ideological reasons, to force change in the socio-political system of a State, or to avoid change in such systems.

They also extend this to all military actions of intervention or military occupation under any pretext, without exception.

77. It should be noted in passing that the contents of these amendments were not reflected in the preamble or in the title of the draft resolution before us.

78. All of these supposed actions, once having taken place, are illegal and condemnable because they infringe on principles contained not only in the Charter of the United Nations but also in specific resolutions, such as the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty [*resolution 2131(XX)*], the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734(XXV)*], resolutions concerning the implementation of that Declaration, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625(XXV), annex*].

79. Given this situation, the Honduran delegation abstained when this draft resolution was put to the vote. None the less, we do want to reiterate how prepared we are to have the Assembly act promptly to develop a global definition of terrorism and legally condemn all its forms.

80. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): As we approach the end of 1984, the Assembly is witnessing efforts by the Soviet delegation to produce yet another example of what George Orwell called "double-think" and "double-talk" before the year runs out. My delegation finds it hardly surprising that the Soviets should do this, in light of Orwell's description of the totalitarian practice of deliberately debasing the language, inverting the meaning of commonly accepted terms and generally accusing others of acts in which they themselves systematically engage. No better illustration of this Orwellian insight could be found than the Soviet use of the term "State terrorism" in the Assembly.

81. The use of terrorism as an instrument of State policy can be seen within two contexts: first, that of domestic usage to maintain a dictatorial régime and to prevent the free expression of the will of the people, and secondly, as an element of foreign policy, that is, the application of terror to other States as a means of achieving foreign policy goals. Our century has a tragic record of the use of the most violent and inhumane methods as instruments of State terror by fascist dictatorships. Yet, the removal of fascism from the face of Europe 40 years ago regrettably did not bring relief from the practice of State terrorism.

82. On the contrary. The ghastly record of Soviet terror continues. It has been well, and often very eloquently, presented by a host of its victims, from Nobel Prize laureates to the most humble survivors of the Gulag. This record dates from the very first days of Soviet power and is so vast that it requires large volumes of tightly printed pages only to give a general summary. Shelves of documentation now exist on the terrorism which the Soviet State has deliberately directed at peasants and workers alike, at soldiers and intellectuals, at believers and sceptics, even at loyal party members and the ranks of the secret police themselves. It has encompassed the creation of deliberate famines over large areas in order to eliminate entire social classes, the forced removal into the depths of Central Asia of entire nations which were suspected of lack of loyalty to the State, the planned annihilation of religious believers of a wide spectrum of faiths, including Orthodox Christians, Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, Shiite Moslems, Sunni Moslems, Buddhists and many others.

83. The breathtaking scale of the great Stalin terror was too much even for the Soviet régime to paper over completely, as is evident from the numerous revelations put before the twentieth and twenty-second Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Yet, just as Orwell predicted, the Soviet totalitarian régime has long since decided to rewrite the history of their party and to pretend not only that the crimes and abuses never took place, but even that their own revelations of some of these crimes and abuses never took place.

84. Lest anyone here prefer to regard the record of past Soviet crimes against the peoples under its control as some kind of "aberrations on the path to developed socialism", let me note that just a few days ago the Soviet Government chose to celebrate International Human Rights Day by arresting those of its citizens who attempted to mark the occasion at the monument to Pushkin which is located right in the centre of the Soviet capital. Those courageous individuals who lost their liberty on this occasion chose an appropriate location for their demonstration. The poet whose statue marks Pushkin Square spoke valiantly all his life for personal liberty and for freedom of expression and thought. Can we now forget that the current régime in Russia has engaged in thought control and suppression of ideas and thinkers on a scale undreamed of by those Czarist officials who censored Pushkin? Perhaps the demonstrators also recalled that the main speaker at the dedication of the monument to Pushkin was Dostoyevski, a writer whose eloquence in condemning political power based only on materialism and the lust for power has yet to be equalled.

85. Can we now forget that the human and spiritual qualities that Dostoyevski extolled have been the principal targets and victims of the Soviet State and that many of Dostoyevski's writings are still unavailable to readers in his own country, being regarded by the Soviet political masters as potentially dangerous to their own grasp on unlimited power? Perhaps these demonstrators also reflected on the fact that an ancient monastery once stood on the site of their demonstration, but was destroyed as a relic of a spiritual and artistic tradition for which the men in the Kremlin had no use. Can we now forget that in recent days there have been new and intensified attacks on believers in all parts of the Soviet Union, from the Western Ukraine and the Baltic States to the Caucasus and Central Asia? Those who have disappeared behind the walls of Moscow's infamous prisons cannot forget, and neither should we.

86. Evil though the use of State terrorism within the borders of the Soviet Union has been, and continues to be, we must devote at least as much attention to the extension of terrorism as State policy far beyond those borders. I trust that we are not yet so insensitive as to have forgotten the photographs of patriots who attempted to defend their national honour and independence, armed with nothing more than bricks, against Soviet tanks. I trust that we can also be equally sensitive to the continuing evidence of the brutality aimed at freedom fighters who must daily

witness the devastation of their homes and the death and maiming of their families by fiendish instruments such as bombs disguised to look like children's toys. To those who would regard these exercises of Soviet State terrorism as less than an integral part of its foreign policy, I would draw attention to the cardinal principle enunciated by Lenin on 28 February 1918, that "No Marxist could, without breaking with the foundations of Marxism and socialism generally, deny that the interests of socialism are higher than the interests of the right of nations of self-determination."

87. Lenin's theory has been put into practice with mind-numbing repetition—in the Caucasus; in Central Asia; in the Baltic States; in Moldavia; in Poland; in Finland; throughout Eastern Europe, with multiple doses in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland; in Viet Nam and Cambodia; and still, with increasing ferocity, in Afghanistan.

88. The reason why the Soviet Union has resorted to force on those occasions is clear. It is determined to maintain its hegemony in Eastern Europe and as far as possible to dominate other regions on its borders. In order to do so it must suppress, where necessary through armed intervention, any attempt by the peoples of the countries in its so-called zone of influence to develop democratic institutions and to assert genuine independence. In fact one might say that if internal State terrorism fails to ensure undisputed rule by the Communist Party, international State terrorism must be employed to this end. Sometimes the first works: take the case of Poland in 1981. But sometimes things go too far and we have Hungary or Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan. Thus the intensification of internal State terrorism obviates resort to international State terrorism.

89. In conclusion, the shameless introduction by the delegation of the Soviet Union of a draft resolution on State terrorism further demonstrates George Orwell's point that totalitarian régimes seek to hide their own despotic practices by debasing the language, inverting the meaning of commonly accepted terms and accusing others of acts that they themselves systematically engage in. For that reason the United States did not vote for this exercise in multilateral cynicism.

90. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I wish to explain why my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, although we agree with much of its wording. To do this it is necessary to glance at the history of the draft resolution.

91. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union proposed the new agenda item in his statement in the general debate [*10th meeting*]. Despite considerable scepticism, we raised no objection to the inscription of the item on the agenda. That is our standard policy. However, in company with many other delegations, we had profound objections to the draft resolution that the Soviet Union proposed. It was a veiled attack on the policies of the United States of America. At the same time, it was cunningly drafted so as to avoid General Assembly disapproval of the Brezhnev Doctrine—that is, the doctrine by which the Soviet Union has sought to justify its physical intervention in the internal and external affairs of States that share its socio-economic system, but that have in some respects wandered from the path approved by the Soviet Union. Of course, the Soviet draft did not put the matter as clearly as that; the Soviet Union aimed by stealth to twist principles to mean what suited it.

92. After testing the reaction of others, the Soviet delegation evidently judged, rightly, that the majority of the General Assembly was unlikely to support its original draft. It therefore put out a revision that somewhat softened the objectionable passages. But the revised draft was still unacceptable, both for what it omitted and for what it contained. My delegation, together with a number of other like-minded delegations, therefore introduced a set of amendments. A number of non-aligned delegations took the same view and also submitted amendments. In the light of those two sets of amendments, the Soviet delegation gave way further and accepted both of the amendments proposed by the non-aligned and several of the amendments proposed by my delegation and others of like mind. The resulting second revised draft is what the First Committee voted on and what we have before us today.

93. The Soviet delegation has retreated a long way; it has, I am glad to say, accepted some excellent language. But now the resolution says something different from what the Soviet delegation meant it to say.

94. In the circumstances, the Soviet delegation ought to have withdrawn its draft resolution—that is, unless it has changed its fundamental policies. It is cynical and damaging to international relations to say one thing and do another.

95. In its first preambular paragraph the draft resolution talks about "the obligation of all States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State". I emphasize the use of the word "any". How do we square this new-found probity with the events of 1956 and 1968? The first preambular paragraph also talks about "the inalienable right of all peoples to determine their own form of government and to choose their own economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion and constraint of any kind whatsoever". I emphasize the words "of any kind whatsoever". What about the people of Afghanistan?

96. Paragraph 2 reads as follows:

> "*Demands* that all States take no actions aimed at military intervention and occupation, forcible change in or undermining of the socio-political system of States, the destabilization and overthrow of their Governments and, in particular, initiate no military action to that end under any pretext whatsoever and cease forthwith any such action already in progress;".

I emphasize "cease forthwith any such action already in progress". Again I ask: what about Afghanistan? I also ask whether the Soviet Union has ceased its attempts to undermine the socio-political system of States in Africa, in Latin America and in Asia.

97. In paragraph 1 the Assembly "*Resolutely condemns* policies and practices of terrorism in relations between States as a method of dealing with other States and peoples". Yet we have seen little sign of willingness on the part of the Soviet Union, in practice, to co-operate with other countries in trying to stamp out terrorism.

98. My delegation is in favour of all the passages of this resolution which I have quoted—and, indeed, some others—but in the plain and original meaning

of the words used, not in the twisted meaning that the Soviet Union is trying to imply they have. Some of the statements we have heard in connection with this resolution, and with the whole subject of State terrorism, remind me of Humpty Dumpty. "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean, nothing more, nothing less". This is an attitude which strikes at the roots of the proper conduct of international relations just as surely as terrorism against diplomats.

99. If words are not used honestly they become debased. It may be said that words are only symbols, but if the words are devalued what they symbolize is also devalued. This is particularly serious when the words in question are taken from the Charter of the United Nations. We have all sworn to uphold that Charter. It is very important that the principles it enshrines are not twisted to serve particular national ends.

100. My delegation stands by the plain and original meaning of the Charter. We are in favour of the Charter and against State terrorism. That is not our problem with this resolution. Our problem with it is the wide gap between the actions of the sponsor of the resolution and its language. It would be naïve to expect that the Soviet Union is about to change its fundamental policies, and it is therefore against this element of dishonesty in saying one thing and doing another that we protest. That is the reason for our abstention.

101. The PRESIDENT: The necessary technical discussions having been completed, the Assembly will now return to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 55 [*A/39/745*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/39/795. The First Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/160).

102. The PRESIDENT: In the light of the statement made earlier by the Rapporteur concerning the venue of the meetings of the Preparatory Committee of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, may I take it that the Assembly decides that the preferred venue for the Preparatory Committee should be Geneva, provided that this would not involve any additional expenditure for the United Nations?

It was so decided (decision 39/424).

103. The PRESIDENT: I call now on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

104. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): As long as the United States remained silent on the question of State terrorism, it behaved wisely. Evidently one does not speak of rope in the house of a hanged man. Today, however, when the General Assembly has adopted, by an overwhelming majority of its Members, a resolution against State terrorism, the United States has, in full view, committed an elementary stupidity: by expressing its irritation on this occasion the way it did, the United States quite voluntarily acknowledged that this resolution was aimed against it. We congratulate it on having accepted that fact. Now the General Assembly resolution condemning State terrorism has an unmistakable addressee: the United States of America.

105. The PRESIDENT: I wish to congratulate all delegations on the efficient way in which the work was conducted and on the expeditious disposal of a heavy agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

NOTES

[1] The delegations of Saudi Arabia and Ghana subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution.

[2] The delegations of Guinea-Bissau, Saudi Arabia and Somalia subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[3] The delegation of Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[4] The delegations of Iraq and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[5] The delegations of Nepal and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[6] The delegation of Brazil subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[7] The delegations of Bolivia and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[8] The delegations of Nepal and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[9] The delegation of Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[10] The delegation of Liberia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[11] The delegations of Brazil and Liberia subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[12] The delegation of Costa Rica subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[13] The delegation of Liberia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

[14] The delegation of Saudi Arabia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

103rd PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 17 December 1984,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 40

Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations in 1985: Report of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations

1. The PRESIDENT: In section V of its report [*A/39/49*], the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations recommends to the General Assembly for adoption a draft resolution and a draft decision. In addition, the Assembly also has before it draft resolution A/39/L.45, and I call on the representative of India, who wishes to introduce that draft resolution.

2. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): I have the honour to address the General Assembly on behalf of all the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

3. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries attaches the highest importance to the observance of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. This stems from its deep and abiding commitment to the United Nations, to preserving and strengthening the Organization, and to making it fulfil more effectively the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

4. As the former Chairman of the Movement, the late Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, stated in the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, "firm faith in the United Nations is central to the non-aligned" [*9th meeting, para. 5*]. That conviction was manifested at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, as indeed it has been at every earlier summit meeting. At that conference, the Heads of State or Government

> "stressed the importance of the United Nations as the most appropriate international forum for finding solutions to major world issues such as the achievement of general and complete disarmament, the realization of the new international economic order, the elimination of colonialism and racism and the promotion of human rights."[1]

5. In their "Conclusions and recommendations", the Heads of State or Government declared:

> "The non-aligned countries reaffirm their firm adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and fully recognize the need to support and strengthen the world Organization in order to make it an effective instrument for the fulfilment of its central role in the maintenance of international peace and security, in developing and strengthening co-operation among nations, in establishing equitable economic relations between States and in promoting fundamental rights and freedoms in the world."[2]

6. Further, the Heads of State or Government called upon the international community to observe 1985 as the Year of the United Nations.

7. If I have quoted at some length from the New Delhi Political Declaration, it is to illustrate the firm and continuing commitment of the non-aligned countries to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to the strengthening of the world Organization. In view of the importance they attach to the United Nations, the non-aligned countries are resolved to involve themselves actively in the preparation and observance of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. On 14 September 1984, my delegation officially introduced in the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations, on behalf of the delegations of all non-aligned countries, draft resolution A/AC.222/L.1 [*A/39/49, para. 38*].

8. It was our view that the draft resolution reflected the common interests and concerns of the international community. We subsequently conducted extensive negotiations on the text with delegations and groups of delegations in a spirit of compromise. Thus, consistent with our firm conviction that the activities and approaches that will govern the commemoration should enjoy universal consensus and support, we agreed to make numerous adjustments, with a view to meeting the concerns and interests of all delegations.

9. The constructive approach adopted by the non-aligned countries has been recognized by one and all. Nevertheless, the consensus so ardently sought by the non-aligned on that document—that is, draft resolution A/AC.222/L.1—eluded us. The non-aligned have always shown understanding for the concerns and sensitivities of others and have always remained, and still remain, ready to co-operate. Unfortunately, however, that same spirit of understanding for our concerns and sensitivities is not always displayed by others. It was with considerable regret, therefore, that we had to abandon our efforts.

10. The draft resolution submitted by India on behalf of the non-aligned countries stays on the record as reflecting the views of those countries in regard to the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

11. Subsequently, we submitted draft resolution A/AC.222/L.2, and draft decision A/AC.222/L.3, for consideration by the Preparatory Committee with a view to their recommendation for eventual adoption

by the General Assembly [*A/39/49, paras. 71 and 72*].

12. Draft resolution A/AC.222/L.2 was adopted by consensus in the Preparatory Committee on 14 December 1984, and it is now before the General Assembly for its consideration. It refers to the theme that the non-aligned countries have proposed for the anniversary—namely, "United Nations for a better world." We believe that this theme underscores the abiding relevance and importance of the United Nations and its role in shaping a better future for humanity in a world without war. It suggests that the commemorative session of the General Assembly next year should be for a short period, culminating on 24 October 1985 and coinciding with the proclamation of the International Year of Peace. It requests the Preparatory Committee to draw up a suitable text for a final document or documents to be considered for signature and/or adoption during the commemorative session. It expresses the hope that Heads of State or Government will find it possible to participate in the commemorative session in order to enhance its significance. It recommends that 1985, the year of the anniversary, be observed as the Year of the United Nations.

13. The draft resolution is mainly procedural in nature, taking note of the programme and activities recommended by the Preparatory Committee, continuing the Committee's mandate to function until the observance of the anniversary and requesting the Secretary-General to provide the necessary facilities.

14. On 14 December 1984, the draft decision was also adopted by consensus by the Preparatory Committee, after the deletion of subparagraph (*e*) from the draft text that had been submitted to the Preparatory Committee. The draft decision is also, in a sense, procedural and involves certain necessary matters of detail. It makes a number of recommendations in the context of the observance of the anniversary, addressed to Governments and Member States, specialized agencies and other international organizations of the United Nations system, the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat and the international mass media. The suggestion that the commemorative activities should reflect the fact that 1985 had been designated as International Youth Year was also considered in the Preparatory Committee's report [*A/39/49, para. 28*]. Following consultations, the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee recorded the understanding that the commemorative activities of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations should reflect in an appropriate manner the observance in 1985 of the International Youth Year. This understanding is reflected in the report [*ibid., para. 51*].

15. Subparagraph (*e*) of the draft decision, which has since been deleted, took note of the twenty-fifth anniversary, also in 1985, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and proposed that the events commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations should appropriately reflect that event. My delegation, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, reluctantly and with deep regret agreed to delete subparagraph (*e*) from the draft decision, in the interest of consensus, on the clear understanding that it retained the option to introduce, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, a draft resolution along the lines of this subparagraph for action by the General Assembly when the item came up for decision in the Assembly. I refer to paragraph 53 of the report of the Preparatory Committee, in which this matter is set out. Accordingly, the draft resolution submitted by my delegation on behalf of the non-aligned countries Members of the General Assembly is before the General Assembly for consideration.

16. The non-aligned countries are conscious that the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations will be commemorated against the backdrop of an increasingly worsening international situation, characterized by tensions and conflicts which have been aggravated by the threat or use of force, acts of aggression, intervention, interference, bloc policies and confrontation; by a deepening world economic crisis which has had particularly adverse effects on developing countries; and by the growing threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the spiralling nuclear-arms race and the increased risk of nuclear war. The non-aligned countries are convinced of the vital need to reverse these trends. We firmly believe that the United Nations system is a unique and indispensable negotiating forum for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the objectives of the Charter of the United Nations. We are convinced that the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations should be an occasion for a determined rededication by the Member States to the purposes and principles of the Charter and a reaffirmation of their commitment to give those purposes and principles full effect. It should also be an occasion to review the performance of the United Nations system over the past four decades, with a view to enhancing its role and effectiveness towards the achievement of peace, security, justice and development. We are concerned that there have been attempts to weaken the role of the United Nations in international relations.

17. The non-aligned countries stress in particular that Member States should firmly commit themselves to give full effect to the principles of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, non-use or threat of use of force, the elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination, the right to independence of peoples under colonial domination and foreign occupation, the maintenance of international peace and security, disarmament and particularly nuclear disarmament, the development of friendly relations among nations, and the achievement of international co-operation in resolving global problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character.

18. As I stated earlier, the year 1985 will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. The United Nations has played an important role in its implementation, and we expect that the Organization's fortieth anniversary will reflect in an appropriate manner the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of this Declaration, with a view to strengthening the international commitment to the total eradication of colonialism.

19. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we should recall certain historic General Assembly resolutions: resolution 3201 (S-VI)

and 3202 (S-VI), adopted on 1 May 1974 at the sixth special session, and containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order; resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States; and resolution 3362 (S-VII), on development and international economic co-operation, adopted on 16 September 1975 at the seventh special session. We call upon Member States to take urgent steps towards the early establishment of the new international economic order as well as the new international information order.

20. We should also take note of significant documents adopted within the United Nations system, including in particular the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*], the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States [*resolution 36/103, annex*], and the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes [*resolution 37/10, annex*].

21. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we would also appeal to Member States to give urgent consideration to the ratification of or accession to those multilateral instruments that have been adopted and/or supported by the United Nations and that have not entered into force for lack of sufficient ratifications or accessions, or have entered into force but could be strengthened by additional ratifications or accessions, as well as to their effective implementation.

22. In this connection, we call, *inter alia*, for the acceptance, ratification and putting into effect of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

23. A befitting observance of the forthcoming event—the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations—is an exercise of common interest and concern; needless to say, this calls for a spirit of accommodation and understanding on all sides. I would like to assure you, Sir, that the non-aligned countries, for their part, will not be found wanting in this regard.

24. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community.

25. The United Nations and the European Community share a common origin: the terrible suffering and destruction wrought by the Second World War. The member States of the Community and the United Nations therefore share one overriding purpose: a determination to ensure that international disputes be resolved by peaceful means and that the recurrence of war be prevented. The Ten believe that 24 October 1985, the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the Charter of the United Nations, should be regarded not just as a time to review the achievements of the past four decades but also as an important opportunity for the international community to look to the future. We welcome whole-heartedly the note struck by the Secretary-General in his statement at the opening meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations, when he said that the occasion should be used above all to encourage a rededication by Member States to the principles and purposes of the Charter, to promote interest in the work of the Organization and support for its efforts and to reinvigorate international co-operation in all fields of human endeavour.

26. We should recall that when the United Nations was established in 1945, its success was by no means assured. It is therefore a considerable achievement that, 40 years later, the Organization is firmly established as the premier international forum for the consideration of the world's problems, whether political, economic or social. It makes a vital contribution to the necessary dialogue between all countries of the world, be they Eastern or Western, developing or developed.

27. There are other major achievements to celebrate in the anniversary year. A further global conflict has been averted, and the United Nations has contributed significantly to the containment of regional conflicts, notably through its peace-keeping operations, in which the Ten are proud to have played a major part. The past 40 years has been a dramatic and successful period of decolonization which has led to an increase in the membership of the United Nations from 51 to 159. Moreover, the Organization and its specialized agencies have done much to tackle problems of human misery throughout the world. The efforts currently under way in Ethiopia and other African countries are but the latest examples of the effective action the Organization can take.

28. Nevertheless, Member States, in celebrating such achievements, must also ask why, despite the expressed commitment of all to the principle of international co-operation, the world continues to be plagued by regional conflicts, tensions between the super-Powers, economic and social injustices and abuses of human rights.

29. The Secretary-General, in his report to the thirty-seventh session on the work of the Organization, underlined the seriousness of the situation when he stated that "we have strayed far from the Charter in recent years".[3] He expressed concern that the possibilities of the United Nations, especially of the Security Council, as a negotiating forum for urgent international problems are not being sufficiently realized or used. The question of whether present practices in the United Nations are in all instances the best suited to promote concrete and just solutions and strengthen confidence in the Organization has been raised by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization in 1984 [*see A/39/1*]. The Ten would like to associate themselves with his admonition that "We should beware of blurring the separate and specific functions of the main organs and specialized agencies by treating them as interchangeable platforms for pursuing the same political aims. Issues must be dealt with primarily on their own merits and in their own context."

30. The Ten share his concern at the weakening in recent years of the multilateral approach to international questions. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland, speaking in the general debate earlier in this session as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers of the European Community, underlined the "evident need for a recommitment to a multilateral approach which would draw on the energy, the imagination and the potential for co-operation of the

majority of the Assembly" [*see 6th meeting, para. 192*].

31. In this regard, he expressed the support of the Ten for "the endeavours of the Secretary-General to increase the relevance of the Organization and to improve its functioning" [*ibid., para. 112*].

32. Over its 40 years the Organization has been severely tested by a series of international political and economic crises. This anniversary, which coincides with the proclamation of the International Year of Peace, provides a timely opportunity for a reassertion of States Members' commitment to multilateralism, not as a bureaucratic exercise but as an essential element in the endeavour to eliminate the horrors of war and to ensure the achievement by each human being of a life of freedom and dignity.

33. The principles underlying the approach of the Ten to international affairs have been stated before in this forum. In sum, we are committed to the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations; we believe in the fundamental importance of human rights and in the need for States to respect, by their actions as well as their statements, internationally agreed human rights standards; we are committed to the rule of law and to dialogue in international relations; we recognize the right of all States to security and independence and of all peoples to the determination of their own destiny; we are committed to the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. In keeping with these principles we express the hope that the fortieth anniversary of the Charter will be marked not only by appropriate ceremony but also by real progress in the promotion and upholding of multilateralism.

34. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): This plenary meeting of the General Assembly marks the end of the first phase of the work of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations.

35. The Committee, in our opinion, did achieve a measure of success through the adoption by consensus of the texts of a draft resolution and a draft decision that were so ably elaborated by the delegation of India and submitted by Mr. Krishnan. The delegation of Yugoslavia supports this effort by India in its entirety.

36. It is important and essential that the draft resolution before the Assembly [*A/39/49, para. 71*], envisages that the commemorative session of the General Assembly shall be held for a short period culminating on 24 October 1985; that the text of a final declaration will be prepared for adoption during the commemorative session; and that an invitation should be extended to heads of State or Government to participate in the commemorative session in order to enhance its significance.

37. It should be recalled here that at the recent Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, stress was laid on "the importance of strengthening the role of the United Nations in dealing with the crucial issues concerning peace, security, disarmament and development" [*see A/39/560, annex, para. 137*].

38. They emphasized that the United Nations, particularly the General Assembly and the Security Council, offered the best framework for the promotion of those goals. We should do our best to make reason prevail so as to leave the next generation a better future, they said. That view was reflected in the statements of almost all the participants in the general debate at this session of the Assembly.

39. The political and economic situation in the world is bleak, and even the existing fragile bases for peace are threatened. Unless the present situation starts changing, the dangers threatening the world will evade any control, and that may have unforeseeable consequences. The anniversary is going to be commemorated against the backdrop of an increasingly worsening international situation characterized by tensions and conflicts, aggravated by the threat or use of force, acts of aggression, intervention, interference, bloc policies and confrontation, domination and exploitation, a deepening world economic crisis with particularly adverse effects on developing countries and a growing threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the spiralling nuclear-arms race.

40. In an interdependent world, there is no better place where this gloomy perspective can be prevented than the United Nations. Only last week the Secretary-General delivered an inspiring statement on the nuclear-arms race that should serve as additional impetus in the preparations for the anniversary of the Organization as well.

41. The fortieth anniversary of the United Nations is an important event. It is testimony to the fact that the world Organization has justified its existence, that it is capable of adapting to changes in international relations, that its role as a forum for dialogue is indispensable for the maintenance of peace and security in the world and for the establishment of new political and economic relations based on the equality of all peoples and countries of the world.

42. The United Nations has also been and remains an indispensable factor in uniting and bringing together nations of different sizes and economic power. It is the indicator of the aspirations of the international community and the single multilateral forum for the harmonization of views on the basis of equality of all the members of the international community on all the crucial problems of today. However, the United Nations is not and should not be a forum for debate only. Rather, the United Nations should be ever more a forum for negotiations and dialogue, an instrument for progress and the strengthening of independence, sovereignty, equality and freedom.

43. Preparations for the United Nations anniversary are a unique opportunity for another effort towards the solution of present issues of peace, security and development. A political content and political character of the anniversary would best contribute to strengthening its role and seeking solutions by means of negotiations through the world Organization.

44. In the programmes that we prepare a prominent place should be given to reaffirmation and recommitment to the Charter of the United Nations. Developments in the course of the past 40 years unequivocally prove the full validity and vitality of the Charter. They also show that the achievements of the world Organization have been positive and that it is an instrument for constructive changes and progress.

45. It would be useful to recall here the contribution of the United Nations to the anti-colonial revolution, which has substantially changed the political map of the world and thus the membership of the

United Nations as well. Therefore particular importance should be given to the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

46. In 1985, other anniversaries will be observed, such as those of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*] and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*].

47. In order to overcome the problems facing the United Nations it is necessary to comply with adopted decisions and resolutions. The implementation of declarations and accession to and respect for multilateral conventions concluded within the United Nations would enhance its role and credibility in international relations.

48. The new international economic order, the new world information and communication order, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States [*resolution 36/103, annex*], as well as others, are valuable concepts and documents that are not to be relegated to the archives. Reaffirmation of the commitment of Member States to implement them is certainly needed.

49. Some Member States are increasingly turning away from their previous commitment to multilateralism and are increasingly pursuing more and more of their interests through bilateral channels. We feel the anniversary will be an opportunity for all the Member States to manifest their commitment to negotiations and to multilateralism as a form of co-operation indispensable for overcoming crises and for substantial improvement of mutual relations.

50. The observance will be successful if it is done with the support and the consensus of all Member States. However, it may be necessary to recall here that consensus is a vehicle for moving forward rather than for limiting the scope of agreements arrived at earlier. And, finally, we feel that positive political will will be needed—more of it than we have seen during the present phase of the work of the Preparatory Committee.

51. We are looking forward to working under your chairmanship, Mr. President, and we of the Yugoslav delegation are offering our full co-operation in the joint efforts to make the United Nations more effective and enhance its role in the world.

52. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In respect of the imminent fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, quite naturally the desire arises to look at the path travelled by the Organization and at the situation in the United Nations at the present time, as well as at ways and means for enhancing its effectiveness.

53. The United Nations was established at a time when the battles of the Second World War were still going on. The great victory over fascism—the fortieth anniversary of which we will be solemnly celebrating next year—will never grow dim in the memory of mankind. That victory was dearly bought. The Soviet people lost 20 million lives, and it cost us unprecedented destruction in our history. The magnitude of the victory of the Soviet people is ever greater because they made a decisive contribution to saving mankind from the fascist yoke. That feat was achieved in the name of peace and life on this earth.

54. The lessons of the Second World War are of abiding importance. The main lesson is that we have to fight against war before it starts. Historical experience teaches us that to defend peace we need harmonized, active efforts by all peace-loving forces.

55. The Soviet Union considered the task of maintaining international peace and security to be of the essence in establishing the United Nations and formulating its Charter. We continue to hold that position today and consistently support enhancing the role of the United Nations in these matters. As stressed in connection with the visit of the Secretary-General to the Soviet Union in July of this year: "The Soviet Union will continue to bring its political weight and moral authority to bear to enhance the role of the United Nations as the primary instrument for strengthening international security, peace and co-operation among peoples of the world."

56. The question of principle is, how can we move closer to the goal of the Charter of the United Nations, namely, how can we "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war"? As experience has rightly shown, there is only one answer to this, and that is the answer provided by the Charter. Success in building a stable peace can be achieved only on the basis of the concerted actions of States against aggression, against the suppression of the freedom of peoples and in favour of strengthening the sovereignty and equality of States and reaffirming the principle of peaceful coexistence in relations between States irrespective of differences in their socio-political structures.

57. A realistic assessment of the role of the United Nations in the system of international relations enables us to state that the Organization has managed to make a positive contribution towards the resolution of acute international problems in instances when Member States demonstrated willingness to be guided by the provisions of the Charter and when they made persistent collective efforts to attain the goals of the Organization.

58. The Charter of the United Nations is a reliable basis for ensuring the peaceful life of peoples and for developing inter-State relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. In this nuclear age, the link between ensuring international peace and security and halting the arms race is becoming ever closer. Attempts to damage the security of anyone or to seek to gain one-sided advantages over others must always be resisted. Any attempt to subvert the security of others subverts one's own security. The interests of one's own national security cannot be invoked in order to damage the security of other countries with impunity or to interfere in their internal affairs. Reliance on the use of force and on destabilizing inter-State relations carries the threat of nuclear war, with all its catastrophic consequences.

59. The only realistic prospect for strengthening international peace and security, therefore, lies in averting another world war. Alarm at the increasing threat of a nuclear war and the dangerous developments in the international situation is acutely felt by the United Nations. Suffice it to recall the declarations and resolutions adopted in recent years by the United Nations condemning nuclear war, the undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the

freezing, both quantitatively and qualitatively, of nuclear arsenals, the prevention of the militarization of outer space, the strengthening of the cardinal principle of the Charter on the non-use of force and so forth. The results of the voting on these resolutions and the attitudes taken towards them are better testimony than any words to the true position of States on the key issues of the day and indicate a universal awareness of the need to bring about a decisive improvement in this dangerous situation and make genuine progress towards peace.

60. Over the years the United Nations has, to its credit, taken a number of practical steps to curb the arms race: the prohibition of bacteriological weapons, treaties on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes and so on. In this field, however, the United Nations will have to do much more than it has done heretofore. The efforts and decisions of the United Nations have promoted in a tangible way the break-up of the colonial system and the emergence of some 100 States that have become full Members of the United Nations. However, it is still important today to put a definitive end to the vestiges of colonialism, *apartheid* and racism and to the machinations of neo-colonialism.

61. In assessing the 40 years of the work of the United Nations, it can be said that, by and large, the balance is a positive one. The Organization has made a positive contribution towards implementing the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter. The Security Council has helped to resolve a number of acute international crises. The search for a solution to existing conflicts is the overriding task of the United Nations today.

62. With regard to the Soviet Union, in the words of the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, K. U. Chernenko:

> "We favour the peaceful solution of international disputes through serious, equal, constructive negotiations. The USSR will co-operate fully with all States prepared to help to reduce international tension through practical deeds and to create an atmosphere of trust in the world—in other words, with those that truly seek not to prepare for war but, rather, to strengthen the foundations of peace. We believe that all existing machinery should be used fully to that end, including, of course, the machinery of the United Nations, which was created to maintain and strengthen peace."

63. The Soviet Union would like to see the United Nations effective and authoritative and purposefully acting to implement the goals proclaimed in its Charter. We take an optimistic view of the Organization's future; we do not have a negative attitude to it, and we reject malicious attacks on the United Nations. With regard to the draft resolution and draft decision now before the Assembly relating to preparations for the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations [*A/39/49, paras. 71 and 72*], the Soviet Union has no objection to their adoption. At the same time, we regret that, as a result of the position taken by one delegation, the Preparatory Committee was unable to arrive at a consensus on the draft resolution submitted by India on behalf of the non-aligned countries. The important provisions contained in that draft resolution reflect, for the most part, the key issues that all States Members of the Organization are interested in resolving. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, those provisions should be the basis of the relevant document to be prepared for the fortieth anniversary session of the General Assembly. That document should also contain an objective analysis of the work of the Organization over the past 40 years and its positive contribution in many areas.

64. The commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the Organization should lead to an increase in the real contribution by the United Nations to eliminating the threat of a nuclear war, curbing the arms race, improving the international climate and developing broad international co-operation. The vital tasks of the Organization must be translated into concrete action that will help to promote the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

65. Mr. VELAZCO SAN JOSÉ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As we assess the work accomplished by the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations, we wish to put on record our thanks to India for its outstanding efforts to forge a consensus text on the basis of the draft resolution which, in its capacity as Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and on behalf of its members, it submitted to the Preparatory Committee as a basis for negotiations.

66. It is regrettable that the constructive spirit of the non-aligned countries in preparing a moderate text which did not even reflect all the fundamental concerns and the preoccupations of our Movement regarding the complex international political situation was not matched by the same constructive spirit and the necessary political will on the part of some countries so as to reach a consensus on the draft that was originally submitted by the non-aligned countries. We trust that this position will change in the course of the preparatory period remaining until the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary next year.

67. My country attaches particular importance to the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the Organization, since, together with the broad majority of the international community—in particular the developing countries—Cuba considers that the United Nations system constitutes an appropriate and indispensable forum to find the solutions to major world problems, as was recognized by the Heads of State or Government at the Conference held at New Delhi in March 1983.

68. That is why we note with deep concern the pressures some countries have exerted on the United Nations system and, in particular, on some of its specialized agencies, such as UNESCO, UNCTAD and UNIDO.

69. The commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the Organization should provide a timely opportunity for strengthening support for the United Nations system and for unambiguously rejecting any attempt to discredit and weaken its important role in international relations.

70. This historic commemoration should also provide an opportunity to reaffirm the commitment of Member States fully to abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations in practice.

71. This objective is all the more important in an international situation characterized by heightened

tensions and conflicts due to the increasing threat or use of force, acts of aggression, intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States, a sharpening of the economic crisis in capitalism, which has particularly harmful effects on developing countries, as well as the dangers to the very survival of mankind inherent in the aggressive policy of imperialism and the dizzying acceleration of the arms race, in particular of nuclear weapons.

72. The fortieth anniversary of the Organization coincides with another date of particular importance to the international community in general and to the young States, in particular, which have swelled the ranks of the Organization after freeing themselves from the colonial yoke, in many cases after violent struggles for self-determination and independence. We are referring to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

73. Both dates are closely interconnected because of the important role played by the United Nations and its specialized bodies, such as the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in the struggle of peoples to eradicate the last vestiges of colonialism in all its forms.

74. Accordingly, activities to commemorate the fortieth anniversary should appropriately reflect both the gains made in the process of decolonization and the important battles that still lie ahead of us to achieve full implementation of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

75. Our country, as a member of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations, intends to make a contribution within the limits of its possibilities and in a constructive spirit to all of the preparatory work, in order to ensure that the observance of this important historic date will provide a real opportunity to strengthen the United Nations system and enhance its role in international relations and in the solution of the most urgent problems of mankind, such as the struggle for peace, justice and social and economic development on the basis of halting the arms race, achieving disarmament, establishing the new international economic order and a new world information and communication order and developing relations of good-neighbourliness and friendship among peoples.

76. Mr. LEWIS (Canada): Some 24 hours from now, the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly will be suspended. It is therefore not the time for elaborate and lengthy speechifying. But my country cannot let this moment pass without making a few succinct and pointed observations.

77. To put matters quite simply, Canada is both weary and impatient with those who make a fetish of impugning the worth, legitimacy and relevance of the United Nations. It happens all too frequently outside this body; it even happens, on occasion, within.

78. In Canada's view, the time has come to launch a concerted campaign to defend and to strengthen the United Nations. There is no better moment to start than in the fortieth anniversary year.

79. No one in the Assembly would deny that the United Nations, and many of its organic parts, have frailties. The litany of deficiency is well rehearsed: time and again the detractors tell us that the polarization between the super-Powers reduces the United Nations to impotence; that the rhetorical excesses are extravagant; that speeches and issues and arguments coagulate in the throes of repetition; that the institutional processes are antiquated; that the incremental changes are slow to the point of inertia.

80. To each allegation, there is, alas, some truth. There is some pardonable despair; one can understand the feelings of futility when behaviour at the United Nations turns to rancour or induces immobility. But to succumb to the allegations seems, to Canada, to miss the point on two fundamental grounds.

81. First, the expectations are pitched too high. The United Nations, with the greatest will and idealism in the world, was never meant to be a panacea. It is an institutional arrangement within which individual nations operate, and the commitment and co-operation of each of its sovereign States delimits the measure of its effectiveness.

82. Back in 1946, curiously, in the introduction to his first report on the work of the Organization, the first Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, put it well:

> "The United Nations is no stronger than the collective will of the nations that support it. Of itself it can do nothing. It is a machinery through which the nations can co-operate. It can be used and developed in the light of its activities and experience, to the untold benefit of humanity, or it can be discarded and broken."

83. That brings me directly to my second point. The United Nations has obviously not yet scaled the heights of untold benefit to humanity, nor is it yet, in any sense, discarded or broken. The reality lies somewhere in between, and the reality is impressive indeed.

84. Just take a look at this session. Whatever the inevitable frustrations of individual Member States, even at times over procedural matters such as those of last Friday, we have had a General Assembly session which galvanized itself around Ethiopia, adopted by consensus a formidable declaration on the economic crisis in Africa, achieved by consensus a potentially powerful convention on torture, accepted by consensus a resolution on international drug trafficking, and reached, as well, a consensus on outer space.

85. In other words, whatever the defects in process and substance, whether in plenary or in Committee meetings, the fact remains that this was a productive thirty-ninth session reflecting urgent human concerns, considerable vision and practical measures of response. As such, it stands as a microcosm of the continuing United Nations experience. That experience has, over the 40 years, nurtured the welfare of humankind, and that is why gratuitous, fashionable assaults on the United Nations, to diminish or to demean it, just will not do.

86. The various agencies—whether UNICEF, UNDP, WHO or UNRWA—represent, all in all, the finest expressions of human aspiration and dedication. The triumph of international peace-keeping is one of those rare reflections of sustained international sanity.

87. The prestige and influence of the office of the Secretary-General augur well for the future direction of the entire Organization. Indeed, the present incumbent has won the trust of every Member State, as well he might considering his skill and initiatives in Afghanistan, in Cyprus, in Lebanon and in the Iran-

Iraq conflict, to name but a representative few. It is not so much a solution which is required here; it is rather the inspired knack of keeping doors open, countries talking, a vital process going. These modest initiatives help to keep the world on track when all around us there is menace, alarm and hostility. If the United Nations system did not exist, it would be somehow created.

88. To be sure, that section of the Charter which speaks to the most important goal of all—international peace and security—has proved the most intractable. If human survival is the ultimate *raison d'être* of the United Nations—and what else could be?—then we have, admittedly, a long way to go.

89. But given all the other cumulative accomplishments, 1985 should be seen as the year when we marshall every conceivable energy to encourage the super-Powers to negotiate, to compromise and to agree. The process appears to have started. We should now heed the words of the Secretary-General, delivered so eloquently in the Assembly on 12 December [*96th meeting*].

90. None of this is meant to be sanguine. Canada understands just how tough and complex the issues are, and we understand equally that the United Nations is an easy target for invective and derision. But the quality of the critique is fundamentally unsound. There is more vilification than analysis, more axes to grind than hatchets to bury, and, sometimes, silence from those who fear the future or favour the *status quo*.

91. The fortieth anniversary is surely the occasion to turn it all around and to restore to the United Nations that central role envisaged in the Charter.

92. To do that, it will be necessary to attempt some internal reforms. They will be difficult to achieve. We shall have to approach every aspect of process, of procedure, of structure and of substance with immense caution and sensitivity. Here my delegation pays tribute again to the Secretary-General. His three annual reports, individually and collectively, provide us with clear, relevant observations on many of the problems which beset the Organization. More than that, he has offered constructive solutions. Those reports are the starting point for future work on ways and means to strengthen the role and effectiveness of the United Nations. This need not involve elaborate new structures or committees; that could even prove counter-productive. It might be best to begin with more informal contacts amongst interested Member States to identify those areas of common concern which are amenable to improvement, and then to identify improvements of real consequence.

93. In his first speech to the Economic and Social Council, Trygve Lie, if I may hark back again to the words of that first Secretary-General, said:

> "While old problems will be solved, new problems will arise. The advance of science and the whims of nature and circumstances make that certain. But we are agreed to tackle our problems as we know them with stubborn and relentless energy. We will cross the other bridges when we come to them."[4]

Now is the time to reinforce and then to cross those bridges.

94. Only the Assembly brings all of the international issues and all of the Member States together. That is its unique role. Improvements here will have a telling impact on other United Nations bodies and on the difficult issues facing us. You, Mr. President—and I say this with heartfelt appreciation—have already instituted some much-needed reforms in the Assembly. Let us continue that example. Perhaps now is the time to streamline our agenda and to eliminate routine, undebated items. Perhaps we should reallocate more items from plenary meetings to the Committees. Perhaps we can arrange to have more current, less ritualistic, debates on individual items. Perhaps—dare I say it—some repetitive items have exhausted their utility and can be dropped from the agenda. Perhaps greater use of informal contacts across regional groups would generate greater agreement.

95. The Charter begins with the oft-quoted words, "We the peoples of the United Nations". Now it is time that we, the peoples of the United Nations, gathered here in the General Assembly, reflected on our past, and, more important, tackled our future, particularly the fortieth anniversary year, with that self-same stubborn and relentless energy to which Trygve Lie referred.

96. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): My delegation will be pleased to join in the consensus on both the draft resolution and the draft decision of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations [*A/39/49, paras. 71 and 72*]. We of course look forward to the proper celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, which has already achieved so much.

97. However, we wish to express our strong reservations concerning the second draft resolution on the fortieth anniversary, contained in document A/39/L.45. That draft resolution was not adopted by consensus in the Preparatory Committee; indeed, my delegation opposed including in the draft resolution discussed in that group the operative paragraph contained therein. In that draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide that the events commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the Organization should reflect the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

98. We believe that the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations should be made up of elements that all of us can support wholeheartedly. Certainly, there is no scarcity of United Nations achievements which all of us can celebrate. These certainly include, from our point of view, the achievements of the United Nations in the decolonization process. We are prepared to celebrate the achievements of that decolonization process and, indeed, look forward to and continue to work towards the full achievement of decolonization.

99. However, as the Assembly is well aware, the specific Declaration to which the draft resolution in question refers makes no mention of the principle of self-determination. For that reason we could not support it in 1960, nor do we find it possible to support that Declaration today as an integral part of the fortieth anniversary commemoration. Indeed, my delegation and others were unable to vote in favour of a draft resolution last week specifically calling for the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of that Declaration.

100. Given the fact that my delegation and others have not supported this Declaration, and in view of the fact that it is very desirable that commemoration of the fortieth anniversary should prove to be a unifying rather than a divisive occasion, we appeal to

the sponsors of the draft resolution not to press it to a vote.

101. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On this date, 17 December, Honduras is celebrating the thirty-ninth anniversary of its entry as a Member State to the United Nations. That important date in the history of my country fortunately coincides with the date when we are discussing in the General Assembly activities relating to the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. Accordingly, my delegation finds several reasons for participating in this debate on the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations, a Committee of which Honduras is a full member, and on the suggestions of each Member State for further marking this important event.

102. In 1985 there will be several memorable dates, as we shall be celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations as well as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; while on 24 October 1985, the International Year of Peace will be proclaimed and will be connected with International Youth Year and the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. Thus, this last anniversary will provide the best possible opportunity for Member States of the Organization to make a sharp and objective analysis of our achievements and the lacunae in various areas of our universal duties. We should also define specific activities to enhance those achievements or make good those lacunae, in order that the Organization may achieve better results and increase its effectiveness.

103. For Honduras, these are the hopes aroused by the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. We believe that all the preparatory work will not be very meaningful if the occasion becomes a matter of simple protocol in which rhetoric and publicity take the place of an unequivocal expression of political will and a desire for action by all Member States in order to achieve the aims of peace, security and well-being sought by all our peoples.

104. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, in his statement on 9 October before the Assembly, referred to the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations as follows:

> "We are on the eve of a great celebration. In 1985 an organization which was set up to respond to the highest ideals of mankind will celebrate its fortieth anniversary: an organization created to strengthen international peace and security, to develop the links of friendship and co-operation among States, to promote respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms of all human beings, to be the crucible in which all nations might work together to achieve their common objectives.
>
> "A great deal still remains to be done if we are to bring to perfection a legal community of States governed by an order that effectively ensures the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations: the establishment of 'an order for the promotion of peace', as envisaged by the Viennese master, constitutes 'one of the most urgent matters of our times, one on the outcome of which depends the destiny of civilization'.
>
> "In an era characterized by uncertainty, we are obliged to reflect on the factors that prevent us from rising above a legal order which is still primitive, in spite of the advances achieved in the past 39 years. The extremely dangerous situations confronting mankind at large make it essential that we not only speak of disarmament but also disarm; . . . that we not just speak of co-operation, but actually co-operate; that we not just talk of respect for the dignity of man, but dignify him." [*26th meeting, paras. 158 to 160.*]

105. In this necessary review of our conduct as States, we must not overlook the unilateral and partial interpretation that we frequently give to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The international obligations that flow from it cannot be distorted by being implemented on the basis of a shameful policy of blocs that distorts the goals and aims of the United Nations.

106. Hegemonic ambitions should not vitiate the principles that govern the conduct of this world Organization. The interests of the North should not prevail over those of the South. The well-being of some must not and cannot be maintained by the misery of others. The principles of law among nations should not be separated one from the other, nor should they be separated from the obligations of each State to its own people.

107. It is necessary for us to return to the source, to the original ecumenical vision that sought to design a different world. There must be a clear-cut will to enhance efficiency, impartiality and the confidence that the United Nations, as the major international organization, provides the most suitable means of protecting the interests of the community of States, thereby placing the international standard above the individual interests of any of its Members and ensuring the respect of all without any kind of discrimination in regard to political, economic and social systems.

108. The principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations continue to provide the guidelines that the peoples of Member States of the United Nations have recommended that their respective Governments follow by harmonizing their actions in the various bodies of this forum for universal diplomacy and multilateral action. That is Honduras' understanding, and that is why we have continuously reiterated our consistent adherence to universal values and the unrestricted observance of the principles of international coexistence, solidarity and co-operation.

109. In the course of our recent statements, in particular regarding Central America, Kampuchea, the Malvinas, the critical economic situation in Africa, the International Year of Peace, Afghanistan, Namibia and Western Sahara, we have emphasized this, because we basically believe that there must be a common denominator of peace and progress which we all seek for the benefit of all our peoples, and which should prevail over current bilateral rivalries and the differing views of ideological groups.

110. We welcomed the statement made by the Secretary-General when he said:

> "It is frequently said that the Charter of the United Nations is an example of confused idealism conceived without reference to the realities of

world policy. There can be no doubt that the very nobility of the concept of collective security, equal rights, world economic co-operation and the peaceful settlement of disputes has caused disappointment in many circles in view of the fact that from every angle such concepts reveal all too clearly the deficiencies inherent in unilateral and multilateral initiatives. Accordingly we have to reach the conclusion that idealism is an illusion that can confound and dilute pragmatism, which is the only solid basis for national policy. I do not think this is accurate. Any forecasts of the future that are based exclusively on international realities will lead not to improvement but rather to despair.

"Knowledge and understanding of events and circumstances are fundamental to forging solid policies. However, one unique characteristic of knowledge is that, because of its very purpose, it leads to something that transcends it: to a vision of what should be. The same thing occurs with the Charter. The principles governing international conduct provide a solid basis for overcoming the problems of war, injustice and deprivation that afflict mankind in so many regions. These principles can be incorporated in national policies. Indeed, in the years that have elapsed since the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the United Nations, these principles have promoted the achievement of felicitous results in many areas. The seriousness of current problems must not lead us to forget the outstanding achievements of that period. The progress made in the past 40 years in defining human rights and responding to mankind's legitimate aspiration to independence after the period of colonialism and the achievements in health and education reaffirm our conviction that if we bend all our efforts to supporting the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations they will indeed be translated into action."

111. It is clear that the United Nations, as an organization of Governments, is affected in its functioning and in the attainment of its common objectives by the persistent circumstances of unresolved crisis and economic tensions, unresolved ideological confrontations and political conflicts, and unrealized social hopes inherent in the States of which it is composed.

112. This is why each Government bears a clear responsibility in this universal centre and why each Member State has a responsibility to work to ensure that its foreign policy is increasingly in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter and also to show the will actively to encourage the efforts of the Organization on the basis of efficiency and impartiality, criteria that should indeed govern the activities of its various organs and organizations in seeking the common good of all mankind.

113. Such will, which is more necessary than ever in these uncertain times, must continuously be reaffirmed by the organs of the Organization. The forthcoming commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations provides an extremely propitious opportunity for us to reread the Charter and show greater political will to give effect to the principles and achieve the purposes embodied in it. We should call upon all States, without exception, to discharge the duties incumbent on them *vis-à-vis* other States and to respect the rights of all. Only this objective attitude toward international relations can ensure for our peoples the peace, security, justice and well-being that were the aims of our efforts to establish the international Organization.

114. We believe that the institutionalized activities carried out by all Member States within the United Nations bodies have made it possible for us to become increasingly aware of our collective role. Thus we should simplify and improve our working procedures and ensure that they are in keeping with the Charter, in order to ensure that the United Nations provides a forum where we can harmonize efforts to fulfil universal aspirations. Consequently, we must exclude anything that might lead to doubt or differences among Members because of positions of discriminatory and automatic solidarity that would indeed be a divergence from the aims that we all share.

115. The recent adoption by consensus on 3 December of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa [*resolution 39/29, annex*] is a milestone in the history of the Assembly on the historic path taken by the Organization. The solidarity with Africans thus expressed by all Governments is proof of the viability of the international understanding and co-operation that our peoples expect us to achieve on their behalf. This also strengthens our belief that the responsibilities incumbent on each body in the United Nations system should be fulfilled with commitment and unity by Member States in order to ensure the realization of the purposes and principles that are of interest to all mankind. We hope that this visionary perspective will increasingly inspire the political, juridical and administrative bodies of this Organization in their thought and action.

116. The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*], and the International Development Strategy, with its necessary complement of global negotiations on economic co-operation, provide us with basic elements that must not be lost sight of. In this connection, we should also work out standards for our activities to improve and reinforce multilateral economic and social co-operation, and instruments and modalities for the implementation of such co-operation, and we should give further thought to the role of the United Nations in this connection.

117. As we stated on 29 November in the context of the discussion on the question of Namibia [*79th meeting*], we believe we should work together more closely to bring about self-determination, independence, freedom and unity for the Namibian people and to ensure the territorial integrity of that country and the preservation of its natural resources. We must ensure that our direct and special responsibility regarding Namibia is fulfilled, giving it priority consideration and increasing the support which the Secretary-General deserves from all States, thereby making possible the establishment of an international climate conducive to a solution that will mean as speedy an implementation as possible of the United Nations plan for Namibia—at the latest, on the occasion of the commemoration of the anniversary of the United Nations.

118. My delegation concurs with the Secretary-General when he states that:

"The fortieth anniversary of the United Nations provides one more opportunity, not only to consider the performance of the Organization in the course of the past four decades, but also and in particular to ensure that Member States will further respect the purposes and principles of the Charter to promote interest in the endeavours of the Organization and to support its efforts and revitalize international co-operation in all areas of human activity. There can be very little doubt that the commemoration, if based on such an approach, could indeed promote the cause of international understanding."

119. On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War and the creation of the Organization, I should like to reaffirm the political will of Honduras further to merge its efforts with those of all other States who also wish to make certain that their national policies will be free from ideological interests and mental reservations, so as to ensure that we shall be able to achieve the extremely important objectives of peace and universal well-being. Accordingly, we should like to reiterate our readiness to work with persistence and interest in order to achieve the peaceful, just and honourable solution of political problems confronting States in various regions of the world. We wish to ensure security for economic and social co-operation and to support and enhance the responsibilities borne by the respective continental organizations, as well as those of the world Organization.

120. This renewed political will on the part of all Member States would enable the United Nations to ensure a better world. It could preserve coming generations from the scourge of war and provide a future in which liberty, tolerance, justice and progress would indeed encompass harmonious and civilized co-existence among all peoples of the world. In this spirit, we shall worthily bequeath to succeeding generations a destiny which would be imbued with the message that we frequently repeat at the beginning of each new year, that is to say, "Peace on earth to men of good will".

121. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now begin the voting process. The Assembly will first turn its attention to the recommendations contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations [*A/39/49, paras. 71 and 72*]. As indicated in paragraph 54 of the report, the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee would not entail any additional costs. The Committee recommends the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 71 of its report. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/161A).

122. The PRESIDENT: The Preparatory Committee also recommends the adoption of the draft decision contained in paragraph 72 of its report. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/425).

123. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft resolution A/39/L.45. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 143 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 39/161 B).[5]

AGENDA ITEM 80

Development and international economic co-operation:

(*a*) International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade:

(i) Report of the Committee on the Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

(ii) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States: report of the Secretary-General;

(*e*) Science and technology for development: report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development;

(*f*) Food problems:

(i) Report of the World Food Council;

(ii) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*i*) Environment:

- **(i) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;**
- **(ii) Report of the Secretary-General;**

(*j*) Human settlements:

- **(i) Report of the Commission on Human Settlements;**
- **(ii) Reports of the Secretary-General;**

(*k*) Effective mobilization and integration of women in development: report of the Secretary-General;

(*l*) United Nations Special Fund;

(*m*) New and renewable sources of energy: report of the Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy;

(*n*) Implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries: report of the Secretary-General;

(*o*) Immediate measures in favour of the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;

(*p*) Development of the energy resources of developing countries: report of the Secretary-General.

124. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Democratic Yemen) (Rapporteur of the Second Committee) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have the honour to submit to the General Assembly the reports of the Second Committee on all the agenda items allocated to it. The report on agenda item 80 is contained in documents A/39/790 and Add.1 to 17.

125. The report on item 82 is contained in document A/39/792.

126. The report on item 83 is contained in documents A/39/793 and Add.1.

127. Finally, the report on item 141 is contained in document A/39/652.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second Committee.

128. The PRESIDENT: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Second Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant summary records.

129. May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that when the same draft resolution is considered in a main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.

130. May I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

131. We turn now to part I of the report of the Second Committee on item 80 [*A/39/790*]. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of this part of the report?

It was so decided (decision 39/426).

132. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to part II of the report of the Second Committee on item 80 (*a*) [*A/39/790/Add.1*]. In paragraph 8, the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution entitled "Review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/162).

133. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 9 of the same part of the report, the Second Committee also recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft decision entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on social aspects of development". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/427).

134. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to part III of the report of the Second Committee on item 80 (*b*) [*A/39/790/Add.2*]. The Assembly will now turn to paragraph 7. The draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee for adoption is entitled "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States". The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee in document A/39/815. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/163).[6]

135. The PRESIDENT: May I now invite members of the General Assembly to turn their attention to part VI of the report of the Second Committee on item 80 (*e*) [*A/39/790/Add.5*] In paragraph 11, the Second Committee recommends for adoption a draft resolution entitled "Report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/164).

136. The PRESIDENT: The Second Committee also recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft decision entitled "Long-term financial and institutional arrangements for the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development" contained in paragraph 12 [*A/39/790/Add.5*]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft decision is contained in document A/39/829. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/428).

137. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to part VII of the report of the Second Committee on item 80 (*f*) [*A/39/790/Add.6*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the two draft resolutions contained in paragraph 15, which are recommended for adoption. Draft resolution I is entitled "Critical situation of food and agriculture in Africa". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/165).

138. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Food and agricultural problems". May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/166).

139. The PRESIDENT: I invite members of the Assembly to turn their attention next to part X of the report on item 80 (*i*) [*A/39/790/Add.9*]. The Assembly will now take action on the recommendation of the Second Committee in paragraph 21 of this part of the report. Draft resolution I is entitled "Remnants of war". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/167).[6]

140. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolutions II A and B deal with the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification. Draft resolution II A is entitled "Implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification" and draft resolution II B is entitled "Implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification". The Second Committee adopted draft resolutions II A and B without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolutions II A and B were adopted (resolutions 39/168 A and B).

141. The PRESIDENT: The Second Committee also recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft decision entitled "Environment", contained in paragraph 22 of part X of its report [*A/39/790/Add.9*]. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

It was so decided (decision 39/429).

142. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolutions and the draft decision just adopted.

143. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway): Under agenda item 80 (*i*), my delegation introduced a draft resolution on international co-operation on the environment. That draft resolution was contained in document A/C.2/39/L.24. We did so on the assumption that it would be possible during this General Assembly session to take international co-operation on the environment one step forward. The wide support for this effort was reflected in the fact that delegations from many parts of the world were willing to sponsor the text.

144. After lengthy consultations, we almost reached consensus. However, a controversial issue was introduced which diverted attention from the objective that we all shared—that is, to generate and promote international co-operation in the vital field of environmental protection.

145. During the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council, my delegation sponsored a similar draft resolution. Faced with the very same problem—namely, the introduction of an issue outside the framework of our text—we chose to withdraw it.

146. This course of action was certainly not foreseen as an outcome of the deliberations during this session of the General Assembly. However, a situation arose which made us feel impelled, together with the other sponsors, to follow the same path that we had taken during the Economic and Social Council session.

147. At this juncture, it seems more important to look to the future than to dwell on the question of distribution of blame. My delegation sincerely hopes that we shall be able to avoid repetition of this year's experience. We must join forces and work towards this end, making it possible for us next year to reach consensus on international co-operation on the environment, an issue of crucial importance to our common future.

148. Mr. GOETTELMANN (Federal Republic of Germany): This year the General Assembly has adopted only one procedural decision, which takes note of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twelfth session. The twelfth session of the Governing Council dealt with a number of important issues concerning international co-operation in the field of the environment.

149. My delegation was a sponsor of a draft resolution focused mainly on the substantive decisions of this year's session of the Governing Council and aiming at a better understanding of the important role of environmental issues in the broad context of economic and social development. Together with a great number of co-sponsors from many parts of the world, we submitted this draft resolution to the Second Committee for adoption by consensus, conscious of the international dimension of environmental problems, the importance of dialogue between developed and developing countries, and among them, and of the need to combine all efforts and undertake practical measures to protect the environment.

150. My delegation very much regrets that a possible consensus on the substantive text of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.24/Rev.1 was made impossible by the introduction of a controversial amendment outside the framework of environmental co-operation, and that this draft resolution had to be withdrawn by the co-sponsors.

151. My delegation reiterates its concern at the increasing tendency to introduce political questions into technical draft resolutions. Questions relating to peace, security and disarmament are important. These questions, however, do not fall within the competence of the Second Committee and should be dealt with in the appropriate forums.

152. It is our sincere hope that we can avoid a repetition of this year's experience in the future and that we can maintain a genuine consensus on the very important issue of international co-operation in the field of the environment.

153. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on a point of order.

154. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The representatives of Norway and the Federal Republic of Germany said that the General Assembly had not been able to adopt a draft resolution [*A/C.2/39/L.24*] this year on the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, allegedly because a controversial amendment [*A/C.2/39/L.55*] had been submitted. I wish to say the following in order to make things clear to everyone. This "controversial" amendment was, in fact, submitted by my delegation. The "controversy" in it was that it reproduced word for word the consensus that the General Assembly had adopted last year [*see resolution 38/165*]. The sponsors of the draft resolution did not want to reaffirm that consensus.

155. Moreover, when the Second Committee discussed draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.118 on food and agricultural problems, those same sponsors did not want to reaffirm the consensus adopted by the World Food Council in June this year [*see A/39/19, part one, para. 15*].

156. That was all I wanted to say.

157. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider part XI of the report of the Second Committee on item 80 (*j*) [*A/39/790/Add.10*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended for adoption in paragraph 17. Draft resolution I is entitled "Living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/699. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Gabon, Ivory Coast.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 143 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions (resolution 39/169).

158. The PRESIDENT: The following draft resolutions deal with human settlements. Draft resolution II A is entitled "Report of the Commission on Human Settlements" and draft resolution II B is entitled "Co-ordination of human settlements programmes within the United Nations system". May I consider that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolutions II A and B?

Draft resolutions II A and B were adopted (resolutions 39/170 A and B).

159. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "International Year of Shelter for the Homeless". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/171).

160. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to part XII of the report on item 80 (*k*) [*A/39/790/Add.11*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "World survey on the role of women in development", contained in paragraph 6. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/172).

161. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to part XIII of the report on item 80 (*l*) [*A/39/790/Add.12*]. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of this report?

It was so decided (decision 39/430).

162. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to part XIV of the report of the Second Committee on item 80 (*m*) [*A/39/790/Add.13*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 7. The draft resolution is entitled "Implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/173).

163. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to part XV of the report on item 80 (*n*) [*A/39/790/Add.14*]. In paragraph 9, the Second Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/174).

164. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider part XVI of the report on item 80 (*o*) [*A/39/790/Add.15*]. The Assembly will turn to the draft resolution entitled "Immediate measures in favour of the developing countries", contained in paragraph 7. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/175).

165. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to part XVII of the report of the Second Committee, on item 80 (*p*) [*A/39/790/Add.16*].

166. I call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

167. Mr. SAAD (Egypt): With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Development of the energy resources of developing countries", further consultations have taken place and there was general agreement that, in paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, the phrase starting by "taking into account the opinion of Member States expressed before the Second Committee of the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session" should be deleted as it was unnecessary. Therefore, and on this understanding, I propose the deletion of that phrase.

168. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the deletion is accepted by the Assembly?

It was so decided.

169. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Development of the energy resources of developing countries" contained in paragraph 10 of part XVII of the report [*A/39/790/Add.16*]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/814. The Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of that draft resolution. May I take it, in the light of what the representative of Egypt has just said and of the decision of the General Assembly, that the Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/176).

AGENDA ITEM 82

Training and research:

(*a*) United Nations Institute for Training and Research:

(i) Report of the Executive Director;

(ii) Report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) United Nations University: report of the Council of the United Nations University

170. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the Assembly to turn its attention to the report of the Second Committee on item 82 [*A/39/792*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation on the three draft resolutions contained in paragraph 21 of the report. Draft resolution I is entitled "Long-term financing and the future role of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/828. A separate recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 5 of draft resolution I.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central

African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,[7] Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Uruguay.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 103 votes to 15, with 25 abstentions.

171. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution I as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Luxembourg, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted by 127 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions (resolution 39/177).

172. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution II, entitled "United Nations Institute for Training and Research". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/178).

173. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled "United Nations University", was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/179).

AGENDA ITEM 83

Special economic and disaster relief assistance:

(*a*) Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator: reports of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Special programmes of economic assistance: reports of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region: report of the Secretary-General

174. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Second Committee on item 83 [*A/39/793 and Add.1*]. First, we shall turn to part I of the report and take decisions on the 27 draft resolutions recommended for adoption in paragraph 79. Draft resolution I is entitled "Assistance for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the Central African Republic". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/180).

175. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Assistance for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of Equatorial Guinea". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/181).

176. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Special economic assistance to Liberia". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/182).

177. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Assistance to Lesotho". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 39/183).

178. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "Assistance to Democratic Yemen". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 39/184).

179. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Special economic assistance to Benin". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 39/185).

180. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VII is entitled "Special economic assistance to Guinea-Bissau". May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 39/186).

181. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "Assistance to Sao Tome and Principe". May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 39/187).

182. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Assistance to Uganda". May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 39/188).

183. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution X is entitled "Assistance to Cape Verde". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 39/189).

184. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XI is entitled "Assistance to Yemen". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 39/190).

185. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XII is entitled "Assistance to Madagascar". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 39/191).

186. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XIII is entitled "Assistance to Sierra Leone". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 39/192).

187. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XIV is entitled "Assistance to the Comoros". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 39/193).

188. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XV is entitled "Special economic assistance for Swaziland". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 39/194).

189. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XVI is entitled "Special economic assistance to Chad". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XVI was adopted (resolution 39/195).

190. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XVII is entitled "Economic assistance to Haiti". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 39/196).

191. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled "Assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted (resolution 39/197).

192. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XIX is entitled "Economic assistance to Vanuatu". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XIX was adopted (resolution 39/198).

193. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XX is entitled "Assistance to Mozambique". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XX was adopted (resolution 39/199).

194. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XXI is entitled "Assistance to Djibouti". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XXI was adopted (resolution 39/200).

195. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XXII is entitled "Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XXII was adopted (resolution 39/201).

196. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XXIII is entitled "Economic and financial assistance to Guinea". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XXIII was adopted (resolution 39/202).

197. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XXIV is entitled "Assistance to the Gambia". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XXIV was adopted (resolution 39/203).

198. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XXV is entitled "Assistance to Nicaragua". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XXV was adopted (resolution 39/204).

199. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XXVI is entitled "Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XXVI was adopted (resolution 39/205).

200. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XXVII is entitled "Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution XXVII was adopted (resolution 39/206).

201. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the draft decision recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 80 of part I of its report [*A/39/793*]. The draft decision is entitled "Special programmes of economic assistance". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/431).

202. The PRESIDENT: Finally, the Assembly will turn to part II of the report of the Second Committee on item 83 [*A/39/793/Add.1*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation contained in paragraph 7. The draft resolution is entitled "Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/207).

AGENDA ITEM 141

Countries stricken by desertification and drought

203. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Second Committee on item 141 [*A/39/652*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Countries stricken by desertification and drought", which the Second Committee adopted by consensus and which is recommended for adoption in paragraph 8 of the report. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/208).

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 174.

[2] *Ibid.*, para. 189.

[3] See A/37/1.

[4] See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, first year, second session, p. 8.

[5] The delegation of Seychelles subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[6] The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[7] The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

104th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 18 December 1984,
at 11.20 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 80

Development and international economic co-operation (*continued*):

(*c*) Trade and development:

(i) Report of the Trade and Development Board;

(ii) Reports of the Secretary-General;

(*g*) Economic and technical co-operation among developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;

(*h*) Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we take up the reports of the Second Committee, I should like to inform members that agenda item 12 and sub-item 80 (*d*) will be taken up as the last items this morning in order to allow for further consultations. I invite members to turn their attention to part IV of the report of the Second Committee on sub-item 80 (*c*) [*A/39/790/Add.3*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions and draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee for adoption. Paragraph 41 contains six draft resolutions. Draft resolution I is entitled "Specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/209).

2. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Greece, Ivory Coast, Spain, Sweden.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 116 votes to 19, with 6 abstentions (resolution 39/210).[1]

3. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Development aspects of the reverse transfer of technology". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United States of America.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.[2]

Draft resolution III was adopted by 119 votes to 21, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/211).[1]

4. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Specific measures in favour of island developing countries". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution IV?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 39/212).

5. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/39/816. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution V?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 39/213A).

6. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution VI, entitled "Report of the Trade and Development Board". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 39/214).

7. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn to the three draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee for adoption in paragraph 42 of part IV of the report. Draft decision I is entitled "Protectionism and structural adjustment". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 39/432).

8. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II is entitled "Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern African States". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 39/433).

9. The PRESIDENT: Finally, draft decision III is entitled "Specific action relating to the particular needs and problems of the land-locked developing countries; status of the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

Draft decision III was adopted (decision 39/434).

10. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

11. Mr. ABBAS (Bahrain): My delegation's preoccupation is to reaffirm the right of the island developing countries to receive adequate assistance from the competent organizations of the United Nations system as it did during the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, and during the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held at Belgrade from 6 June to 2 July 1983. Nevertheless, we stress the need to exert timely additional efforts to implement the specific measures required to assist island developing countries in offsetting the major handicaps which retard their development process.

12. Subsequently, we participated collectively with other island developing countries in formulating the first draft of this biennial text. We then took part in the intensive informal negotiations to reach a consensus text. However, our full support for draft resolution IV does not imply that we approve of paragraph 18 of the inequitable study by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development reflected in document A/39/463, and as envisaged in paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution IV, which we have just adopted.

13. Ironically, the inexact study discredits the peculiar geographical status of Bahrain as an island. In this context, we would like to place on record our reservations on paragraph 18 of the study I have mentioned.

14. In the mean time, we feel that it is our prerogative to demand that the ambiguity of this paragraph be corrected in accordance with our position, already stated in the Second Committee when this item was debated.

15. Ms. RODRIGUES (Mozambique): The delegation of Mozambique joined in the consensus on draft resolution I, because we believe that concrete and concerted action should be taken in order to enable the land-locked developing countries to face the particular problems imposed by their geographical conditions.

16. Although we abstained in the separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in the Second Committee, we would like to reaffirm the commitment of the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique in dealing with this question in the southern African region on a bilateral and subregional basis.

17. Mr. LEONARDO KAM (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation attributes special importance to draft resolution V, which we have just adopted, because Panama has the fourth largest mercantile fleet in the world. On 20 December 1982, as will be recalled, the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 37/209, in which it decided to convene a conference in 1984 to consider the adoption of an international agreement concerning the conditions under which vessels should be accepted on national shipping registers.

18. Our delegation worked very hard on the text of that resolution and sponsored it. We felt that properly implemented its provisions would lay the groundwork for suitable preparations for the United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships.

19. Regrettably, the work of the Preparatory Committee and the holding of the first part of the Conference were not in keeping with the letter and spirit of resolution 37/209. In spite of that, however, my delegation did not oppose the adoption without a vote of draft resolution V. The Conference is to meet at Geneva from 28 January to 15 February 1985. We believe that the terms of reference and the framework

for the Conference are clearly defined in resolution 37/209, which is still valid and remains unchanged.

20. Accordingly, I wish to reaffirm that resolution 37/209 convened a conference to consider the adoption of an international agreement concerning the conditions under which vessels should be accepted on national shipping registers. It in no way—I stress, in no way—called for the elimination of open registers, as was tendentiously claimed by one member in the Second Committee.

21. I should like to call the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the resolution to which I am referring—draft resolution V—endorses the resolution adopted on 3 August 1984 by the United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships. It is appropriate to point out that in the latter resolution there is an appeal to all participating States to make every possible effort during the resumed session of the Conference to complete the preparation of the international agreement and proceed to its adoption. We believe that it is necessary that all participating States make a genuine effort to bring about understanding and avoid the kind of imposing and mechanical ways of thinking such as appear to be in the minds of certain majority groups.

22. The resolution of 3 August 1984 to which I have referred also contains a recommendation to the President of the Conference to continue consultations with Governments and other parties concerned on questions before the Conference. We believe that if these consultations proceed in good faith, taking account of the genuine interests and legitimate concerns of all parties and in a spirit of accommodation and consensus, with respect for the sovereignty and the rights of all States, this will surely benefit the work of the Conference. To proceed in any other way would only lead to failure.

23. Finally, I should like to stress that my delegation accepts the resolution because Panama is in favour of conciliation, not confrontation; of consensus, not the imposing of conditions.

24. Mr. DUN (United Kingdom): In the Second Committee there was a vote on one paragraph of draft resolution I. If it were possible at this late stage to call for a vote on that paragraph, Mr. President, I should like to do so. If not, I should like to make a statement.

25. The PRESIDENT: I would advise the representative of the United Kingdom to make his statement.

26. Mr. DUN (United Kingdom): I assume from your reply, Mr. President, that it is not possible for us to call for a separate vote on that one paragraph at this stage. I should therefore like to state that our joining the consensus on draft resolution I in no way changes my Government's well-known views concerning the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

27. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to part VIII of the report of the Second Committee on sub-item 80 (*g*) [*A/39/790/Add.7*]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions contained in paragraph 14. Draft resolution I is entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/215).

28. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Activities of the United Nations system in support of economic co-operation among developing countries". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/216).

29. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take action on the draft decision contained in paragraph 15 of part XIII of the report. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/435).

30. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to part IX of the report of the Second Committee on sub-item 80 (*h*) [*A/39/790/Add.8*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution and draft decisions recommended therein by the Second Committee for adoption. Paragraph 9 contains the draft resolution entitled "Biennial programme of work for the Second Committee". May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/217).

31. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 10, the Second Committee first recommends the adoption of two draft decisions. Draft decision I is entitled "Implementation of section II of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system". May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft decision?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 39/436).

32. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft decision II entitled "Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft decision II?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 39/437).

33. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to part XVIII of the report of the Second Committee dealing with proposals submitted under no specific sub-item of item 80 [*A/39/790/Add.17*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the recommendations of the Second Committee. First we turn to the draft resolution in paragraph 16 which is entitled "Development and international economic co-operation . A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 14, with 8 abstentions (resolution 39/218).

34. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to the draft decision contained in paragraph 17 of part XVIII of the report. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/438).

AGENDA ITEM 81

Operational activities for development:

(*a*) Operational activities of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) United Nations Development Programme: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) United Nations Capital Development Fund;

(*d*) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;

(*e*) United Nations Volunteers programme;

(*f*) United Nations Special Fund for Land-Locked Developing Countries;

(*g*) United Nations Children's Fund;

(*h*) World Food Programme;

(*i*) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;

(*j*) Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund and allocation of the remaining balance: report of the Secretary-General

35. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Second Committee on item 81 [*A/39/791*]. The Assembly will now take action on the recommendation of the Second Committee in paragraph 29 of the report, which contains four draft resolutions. Draft resolution I is entitled "Role of qualified national personnel in the social and economic development of developing countries". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/219).

36. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Financing of operational activities for development". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/220).

37. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 22 abstentions (resolution 39/221).

38. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "United Nations Children's Fund". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 39/222).

39. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 30 of its report [*A/39/791*], the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of four draft decisions. Draft decision I is entitled "Operational activities for development". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 39/439).

40. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II is entitled "Report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities on the United Nations Population Award and Trust Fund".

May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 39/440).

41. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision III is entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on United Nations technical co-operation activities". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft decision III was adopted (decision 39/441).

42. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft decision IV entitled "Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund". I have been requested by the Chairman of the Group of 77 to postpone taking a decision on draft decision IV to a later stage. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

43. The PRESIDENT: I have been requested by several delegations to suspend the meeting for a time in order to allow for further consultations on item 12 and sub-item 80 (*d*).

The meeting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*):

(*a*) Report of the Council (Chapters I, II, III (part I, sections D, F and G, and part II, sections A to C and E to G), IV, VI (sections A to C), VIII and IX (part I, sections D, E, J to N and Q));

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

44. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the reports of the Second Committee on item 12 and sub-item 80 (*d*). I request the Rapporteur of the Second Committee, the representative of Democratic Yemen, to present the remaining two reports in one intervention.

45. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Democratic Yemen), Rapporteur of the Second Committee (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am privileged to submit to the General Assembly the following remaining reports of the Second Committee.

46. Under item 12, the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly, in its report [*A/39/789 and Add.1 and 2*], the adoption of eight draft resolutions and four draft decisions.

47. Under item 80, the Second Committee submits part V of its report [*A/39/790/Add.4*] pertaining to sub-item (*d*).

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second Committee.

48. The PRESIDENT: May I now draw members' attention to the report of the Second Committee on item 12 [*A/39/789 and Add.1 and 2*]. The Assembly will first take a decision on the six draft resolutions contained in paragraph 48 of part I of the report [*A/39/789*], which the Second Committee recommends for adoption. Draft resolution I is entitled "Economic development projects in the occupied Palestinian territories". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 138 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/223).

49. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution II entitled "Assistance to the Palestinian people". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 146 votes to 2 (resolution 39/224).

50. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/225).

51. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Confidence-building in international economic relations". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Chad, Chile, Denmark,[3] Finland, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Morocco, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 111 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/226).

52. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "Transport and Communications Decade for Asia and the Pacific. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution V?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 39/227).

53. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VI is entitled "International Conference on Population". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 39/228).

54. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now turn to the draft decision recommended by the Second Committee for adoption in paragraph 49 of part I of its report [*A/39/789*]. The draft decision is entitled "Israeli economic practices in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

The draft decision was adopted by 145 votes to 2 (decision 39/442).

55. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions contained in paragraph 22 of part II of the report [*A/39/789/Add.1*]. Draft resolution I is entitled "Protection against products harmful to health and the environment". The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of this draft

resolution is contained in document A/39/831. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 147 votes to 1 (resolution 39/229).[4]

56. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Transport and Communications Decade in Africa". A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4. If I hear no objection I shall first put that paragraph to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 4 of draft resolution II was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.

57. The PRESIDENT: A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution II. If I hear no objection, I shall first put that paragraph to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

Paragraph 7 of draft resolution II was adopted by 116 votes to 16, with 15 abstentions.

58. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution II as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 130 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions (resolution 39/230).

59. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the draft decision recommended for adoption by the Second Committee in paragraph 23 of part II of its report [*A/39/789/Add.1*]. The draft decision is entitled "Reconvened special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/443).

60. The PRESIDENT: Next the Assembly will take a decision on the two draft decisions contained in paragraph 11 of part III of the report. [*A/39/789/Add.2*]. Draft decision I is entitled "Consumer protection". The Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of this draft decision. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/444).

61. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United States for an explanation of vote.

62. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): It is hardly unknown that my Government has some very real misgivings over United Nations involvement in the regulation of business. We seriously question whether this is a proper role for the United Nations as envisaged in the Charter. Such regulation, we believe, can in most cases be better carried out individually by countries. Nevertheless, the United Nations has in recent years taken an increasingly active stance in this area, spurred on by a limited number of interested delegations, non-governmental organizations and others. The United States, consequently, despite its misgivings, has been called upon to play an important part in these proceedings in the United Nations.

63. In the case of the draft guidelines on consumer protection, a very considerable amount of work has been devoted to the effort culminating in draft decision I. We would like to think that our own efforts on this have been positive, balanced and helpful. We believe those of a number of others, in particular Mr. Mikael Ankers of the Swedish delegation and my good friend Mr. Shaukat Fareed of the Pakistani delegation, have been indispensable in achieving this *ad referendum* consensus.

64. The agreement reached is not, in our judgement, a perfect one, nor could we expect it to be. There are still some things we believe should have been included and others, of course, that would have been better omitted. For example, we think that in referring to hazards it would be far better to speak of unreasonable hazards or perhaps unreasonable risks, since all of us are regularly exposed to normal risks and hazards from which no one would expect special consumer protection. We also have very real doubts as to the need to include references to specific products in what is meant solely to be a set of general guidelines rather than a code of conduct.

65. Nevertheless we believe that, on balance, if we are to have United Nations guidelines on consumer protection, then, through the hard work and spirit of compromise shown by all, we have indeed come up with a sensible, balanced and fair document. We expect and hope to see this document given final approval at the resumed session of the General Assembly.

66. The PRESIDENT: The Second Committee recommends also that the General Assembly adopt draft decision II, entitled "Reports of the Secretary-General". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 39/445).

AGENDA ITEM 80

Development and international economic co-operation (*continued*):

(*d*) Industrialization:

(i) Report of the Fourth General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;

(ii) Report of the Industrial Development Board;

(iii) Report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Organization

67. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to part V of the report of the

Second Committee pertaining to sub-item 80 (*d*) [*A/39/790/Add.4*]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolutions and draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee for adoption. Paragraph 28 contains five draft resolutions. Draft resolution I is entitled "Conversion of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization into a specialized agency". The programme budget implications of that draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/830*]. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/231).

68. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Industrial development co-operation". The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are also contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/830*]. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2 of section II of draft resolution II. If there is no objection I shall put it to the vote first. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

Operative paragraph 2 of section II of draft resolution II was adopted by 117 votes to 16, with 15 abstentions.

69. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution II as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast,[5] Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 118 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions (resolution 39/232).

70. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Industrial Development Decade for Africa". The programme budget implications of that draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/830*]. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 119 votes to 10, with 20 abstentions.

71. The PRESIDENT: Another separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 6.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Ireland, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain.

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 118 votes to 24, with 7 abstentions.

72. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution III as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution III, as a whole, was adopted by 120 votes to 1, with 28 abstentions (resolution 39/233).

73. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Revision of the list of States eligible for membership in the Industrial Development Board". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 39/234).

74. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "World industrial restructuring and redeployment". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 39/235).

75. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to the three draft decisions contained in paragraph 29 of part V of the Second Committee's report [*A/39/790/Add.4*]. Draft decision I is entitled "World industrial restructuring and redeployment". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 39/446).

76. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II is entitled "Mobilization of financial resources for industrial development". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 39/447).

77. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft decision III, entitled "Report of the Fourth General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft decision III was adopted (decision 39/448).

78. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Brunei Darussalam.

79. Mr. SAJI bin Mudin (Brunei Darussalam): I should like to take this opportunity to make a brief statement about the addition of Brunei Darussalam to the lists of States eligible for membership in the Industrial Development Board. I refer to draft resolution IV, which was just adopted by the General Assembly by consensus.

80. My delegation expresses its deep appreciation to Mr. Habib Kaabachi of Tunisia, Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, for introducing that draft resolution in the Second Committee, and its thanks to all the delegations in the Second Committee and here in the General Assembly for supporting our membership on the Board. We are very delighted and very much appreciate that the draft resolution was adopted unanimously on both occasions.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] The delegations of Lesotho and Madagascar subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[2] The delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

[3] The delegation of Denmark subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

[4] The delegation of India subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[5] The delegation of the Ivory Coast subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

105th PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 18 December 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 15

Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs (*concluded*)*

(*a*) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council

1. The PRESIDENT: As the result of the fact that the third restricted ballot held at its 77th meeting on Wednesday, 28 November 1984 was inconclusive, the Assembly will now continue the balloting for one seat which still remains to be filled in the Security Council from an African or an Asian State.

2. In accordance with established practice, there is an understanding to the effect that of the two States to be elected from Africa and Asia, one should be from Africa and one from Asia. Thailand was elected at the 33rd meeting, held on Monday, 22 October 1984. Therefore, one seat still remains to be filled by an African State.

3. I call on the representative of the Congo, who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States.

4. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to report to the Assembly that in accordance with the two notes from the Office of the Organization of African Unity and the Permanent Mission of Madagascar, which were distributed to all delegations, the Group of African States is officially presenting the candidature of Madagascar for the non-permanent seat on the Security Council which is allocated to Africa.

5. In arriving at this single, unanimous candidate, the Group of African States was concerned, above all, with the unity of the Group and the general interests of the international community. Hence the candidature of Ethiopia, which was previously endorsed by our Group, and of Somalia were simultaneously withdrawn. We are grateful to the delegations of Ethiopia and Somalia for having acted so constructively for the sake of Africa and the international community.

6. Our appreciation goes as well to the delegations of Kenya and the Comoros, which also agreed to withdraw for the benefit of a single candidate, thereby making possible our decision to submit the candidature of Madagascar, which they too are pledged to support.

7. Accordingly, we invite the General Assembly to take account of this unanimous decision of the Group of African States which we trust will be agreed to by all delegations, thereby facilitating a final decision on this matter.

8. The PRESIDENT: As the result of the fact that the third restricted ballot, held at the 77th meeting, was inconclusive, we must now, in accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure, proceed to an unrestricted ballot, taking of course into account the statement of the Chairman of the Group of African States.

9. In unrestricted balloting, any Member State from among the African States may be a candidate, except for Zimbabwe, which is an outgoing member not eligible for immediate re-election, and for Burkina Faso and Egypt, which remain members of the Council in 1985.

10. Ballot papers will now be distributed. I request representatives to write the name of one State only. Ballot papers bearing more than one name will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ouyahia (Algeria), Ms. Luostarinen (Finland), Ms. Rovirosa-Priego (Mexico), Mr. Fernandez (Philippines) and Mr. Rydzkowski (Poland) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 3.45 p.m. and resumed at 3.55 p.m.

11. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting for the election of one non-permanent member of the Security Council is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	147
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	147
Abstentions:	11
Number of members voting:	136
Required majority:	91
Number of votes obtained:	
Madagascar	126
Kenya	4
Comoros	3
Burundi	1
Mali	1
Morocco	1

Having obtained the required two-thirds majority, Madagascar was elected a non-permanent member of the Security Council for a two-year period from 1 January 1985 (decision 39/323).

12. The PRESIDENT: I congratulate Madagascar, which has been elected a non-permanent member of the Security Council and I thank the tellers for their assistance in this election.

---

*Resumed from the 77th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 109

Programme budget for the biennium 1984–1985

AGENDA ITEM 110

Programme planning:

(*a*) Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination:

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 111

Financial emergency of the United Nations:

(*a*) Report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations:

(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 112

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency:

(*a*) Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions:

(*b*) Impact of inflation and monetary instability on the regular budget of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General;

(*c*) Feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 113

Joint Inspection Unit: reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

AGENDA ITEM 116

Personnel questions:

(*a*) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General;

(*b*) Respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations: report of the Secretary-General

(*c*) Other personnel questions: reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 118

United Nations pension system: report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board

13. The PRESIDENT: The members of the General Assembly have before them the reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda items 12, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116 and 118 now being considered by the Assembly.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fifth Committee.

14. The PRESIDENT: The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fifth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

15. May I remind the members of the General Assembly that in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the General Assembly decided that when the same resolution was considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once—that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting was different from its vote in the Committee. May I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

16. The General Assembly will first consider part II of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 12, dealing with those chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council which were allocated to the Fifth Committee. Part II of the report of the Fifth Committee is contained in Document A/39/847. The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee which appears in paragraph 4 of the report in the form of a draft decision. The Fifth Committee adopted the draft decision without objection. May I take it that the Assembly also adopts that draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/449).

17. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 109 concerning the programme budget for the biennium 1984–1985. That report is contained in document A/39/839 and contains, in paragraph 67, the recommendations of the Fifth Committee in the form of four draft resolutions, I and II A, B and C.

18. I shall first call on any representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any or all of the draft resolutions recommended by the Fifth Committee under this item. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes have been taken.

19. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America): The plenary Assembly has before it the Fifth Committee's report on the programme budget for the biennium 1984–1985. Section III of draft resolution I contains the Fifth Committee's recommendation to construct new conference facilities for the Economic Commission for Africa.

20. The United States delegation does not view the proposal to spend $73.5 million for a new conference building at Addis Ababa as just one more addition to the budget. As a symbolic statement of the priorities of the United Nations, it represents a perversion of the ideals so eloquently enunciated in the Charter of

the United Nations. It is a cruel rebuff to the poor, the hungry and the downtrodden who have invested their hopes and dreams in the promise of international co-operation. For the General Assembly casually to dispose of this item without consideration of its full implications would be a grave mistake.

21. Daily we see ghastly reports of the deteriorating conditions in Ethiopia. The horrors of the relief centres are beyond imagination. The international community is struggling to cope with one of the worst famines of modern times. Despite current efforts, the situation is expected to worsen in the near future. It is in these circumstances that private citizens, non-governmental organizations and Member States look to the United Nations for leadership.

22. Organizations and programmes of the United Nations system are making significant contributions towards the alleviation of the suffering. But these efforts will be diminished if the General Assembly decides to spend $73.5 million for conference facilities most delegations would privately agree exceed the needs of the Economic Commission for Africa.

23. What signal will the United Nations send to the international community by spending so lavishly on a status symbol for a country where millions are threatened with starvation? What will people contributing to relief efforts in Ethiopia think of United Nations priorities? How can Member States take the United Nations seriously when, at a session focusing on the economic crisis in Africa, the General Assembly makes its largest commitment of financial resources for a conference centre?

24. My delegation believes construction of the proposed Addis Ababa conference centre should be deferred. We do not believe the Organization should allocate limited resources to a prestige project at a time of such unprecedented human suffering. The $73.5 million the General Assembly is asked to devote to this project is an amount of money large enough, for example, to innoculate 1 million children against all major communicable diseases; to build 25,000 wells and install pumps to bring water to 12.5 million people; to feed 125,000 Ethiopian families by providing cash grants for one year; and to supply all of Chad's cereal imports for 1985. All of these more urgent needs could be met at the cost of building one state-of-the-art conference centre.

25. The United States delegation believes the General Assembly should reconsider the propriety of the Fifth Committee's recommendation and reject section III of draft resolution I. In the light of the human suffering in Africa, surely we can establish more humane priorities for the Organization.

26. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendations contained in the report of the Fifth Committee.

27. The Assembly will first consider draft resolution I which is entitled "Questions relating to the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985" and consists of 17 sections, I to XVII. The Fifth Committee adopted section I without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Section I of draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/236, section I).

28. The PRESIDENT: A separate vote has been requested on section II, entitled "Parking in the United Nations Headquarters Garage". As there is no objection to that request, the Assembly will now vote on section II. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain.

Section II of draft resolution I was adopted by 119 votes to 14, with 9 abstentions (resolution 39/236, section II).

29. The PRESIDENT: Section III is entitled "Conference facilities of the Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

Section III of draft resolution I was adopted by 122 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions (resolution 39/236, section III).

30. The PRESIDENT: Sections IV to X were adopted by the Fifth Committee without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Sections IV to X of draft resolution I were adopted (resolution 39/236, sections IV to X).

31. The PRESIDENT: Section XI is entitled "Expansion of the conference facilities of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific at Bangkok". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain.

Section XI of draft resolution I was adopted by 126 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions (resolution 39/236, section XI).

32. The PRESIDENT: Section XII, entitled "Use of experts, consultants and participants in *ad hoc* expert groups", was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Section XII of draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/236, section XII).

33. The PRESIDENT: Section XIII was adopted by the Fifth Committee without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Section XIII of draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/236, section XIII).

34. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote section XIV entitled "United Nations Office at Nairobi". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Papua New Guinea.

Section XIV of draft resolution I was adopted by 124 votes to 21, with 1 abstention (resolution 39/236, section XIV).

35. The PRESIDENT: Section XV was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Section XV of draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/236 XV).

36. The PRESIDENT: Sections XVI and XVII were adopted by the Fifth Committee without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Sections XVI and XVII of draft resolution I were adopted (resolution 39/236, sections XVI and XVII).

37. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolutions II A, B and C, grouped under the general title "Programme budget for the biennium 1984–1985".

38. Draft resolution II A is entitled "Revised budget appropriations for the biennium 1984–1985". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, Romania.

Draft resolution II A was adopted by 124 votes to 17, with 6 abstentions (resolution 39/237 A).

39. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II B is entitled "Revised income estimates for the biennium 1984–1985". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution II B was adopted by 126 votes to 11, with 10 abstentions (resolution 39/237 B).

40. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II C is entitled "Financing of appropriations for the year 1985". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, Romania, Spain.

Draft resolution II C was adopted by 122 votes to 16, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/237 C).

41. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the members of the General Assembly to turn their attention to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 110, concerning programme planning. That report is contained in document A/39/840. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 13 of the report and entitled "Programme planning". It was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly also adopts that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/238).

42. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft decision I recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 14 of its report and entitled "Correction to General Assembly resolution 38/227 A". A recorded vote has been requested. Those in favour please signify; those against; those abstaining.

43. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

44. Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): With reference to draft decision I recommended in paragraph 14 of document A/39/840, I should like to question whether it would be proper for a matter of this kind—namely the correction of what is referred to as a typographical error in an existing resolution—to be dealt with by means of a decision of a subsequent session of the General Assembly. Both the facts—that is to say, the course of events leading to the original decision of the thirty-eighth session—and the procedure now proposed to change that decision have led to a good deal of confusion in the minds of some delegations, including my own. We would, therefore, be grateful for your guidance, Mr. President.

45. The PRESIDENT: I should like to point out that resolution 38/227 A was adopted by consensus. It is an important resolution since it deals with the planning, programming and budgeting procedures. Any move designed to maintain and reinforce that consensus obviously deserves serious consideration. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides that agenda item 110 should be held open for consideration at a resumed session, after appropriate review and analysis have been completed.

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

46. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 111, concerning the financial emergency of the United Nations, which is contained in document A/39/841 and Corr.1. The Assembly will take a decision on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee contained in paragraph 8 of the report in the form of two draft resolutions, A and B, grouped under the general title "financial emergency of the United Nations".

47. I understand that the representative of Burkina Faso wishes to speak on a point of order. I call on him.

48. Mr. ZIDOUEMBA (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): This is not a point of order. My delegation would simply like to say that, had it been present when the decision on item 110 was taken, it would have been in favour of the draft resolution.

49. The PRESIDENT: The statement by the representative of Burkina Faso will be reflected in the verbatim records. I call now on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

50. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt): This is not a point of order either. I had raised my hand before the decision on agenda item 110 was taken. However, now that the decision has been taken, it is too late for me to make my point.

51. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation made by the Fifth Committee regarding agenda item 111. Draft resolution A, entitled "Issue of special postage stamps", was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 39/239 A).

52. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Financial situation of the United Nations". The Fifth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 39/239 B).

53. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 112, concerning the administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is contained in document A/39/842. The recommendations of the Fifth Committee appear in paragraph 11 of the report in the form of two draft resolutions, I and II and in paragraph 12 in the form of a draft decision. I first put to the vote draft resolution I entitled "Impact of inflation and monetary instability on the regular budget of the United Nations". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Cameroon, Chile, Ghana, India, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Maldives, Mauritania, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, Suriname, Swaziland, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 83 votes to 25, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/240).

54. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency". The Fifth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/241).

55. The PRESIDENT: Next I put before the General Assembly the draft decision entitled "Feasibility of establishing a single Administrative Tribunal". It was also adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/450).

56. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 113, concerning the Joint Inspection Unit, which is contained in document A/39/843. The General Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee appearing in paragraph 7 of the report in the form of a draft resolution entitled "Joint Inspection Unit". The draft resolution was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly also wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/242).

57. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 116, concerning personnel questions, which is contained in document A/39/845. The General Assembly will take a decision on the recommendations of the Fifth Committee in paragraph 20 of the report, in the form of three draft resolutions, I to III, and, in paragraph 21, in the form of a draft decision. The Assembly will first take action on draft resolution I entitled "Staff and administrative questions of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions (resolution 39/243).

58. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations", was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 39/244).

59. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled "Composition of the Secretariat", was also adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 39/245).

60. The PRESIDENT: The draft decision is entitled "Amendments to the Staff Rules". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/451).

61. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 118, concerning the United Nations Pension System, which is contained in document A/39/846. The Assembly will take a decision on the two recommendations of the Fifth Committee in paragraphs 9 and 10 of its report, in the form of a draft resolution and a draft decision, respectively.

62. The draft resolution is entitled "Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board". The Fifth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/246).

63. The PRESIDENT: The draft decision is entitled "Investments of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund". It was adopted by the Fifth Committee without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it also?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/452).

AGENDA ITEM 11

Report of the Security Council

64. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to agenda item 11, "Report of the Security Council". I understand that the Security Council has not yet adopted its report. Pending further consultations among members of the Security Council, I propose that the General Assembly retain the item on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to retain this item on the agenda of the current session?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

65. The PRESIDENT: Members of the General Assembly will recall that chapters I, II, VIII and IX (part I, sects. A, B and P and part II, sects. A to E) of the report of the Economic and Social Council [*A/39/3*] were assigned to plenary meetings. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of those chapters of the report?

It was so decided (decision 39/453).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*)*

(*g*) Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit;

(*i*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;

(*j*) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia

66. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to agenda item 17 (*g*). May I invite the attention of members to documents A/39/762/Rev.1 and Add.1.

67. As a result of consultations, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, I have drawn up the following list of candidates for appointment as members of the Joint Inspection Unit for a five-year term beginning on 1 January 1986: Mr. Enrique Ferrer Vieyra of Argentina, Mr. Alain Gourdon of France, Mr. Richard V. Hennes of the United States of America, Mr. Ivan Kojić of Yugoslavia and Mr. Kabongo Tunsala of Zaire.

68. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to appoint those candidates?

It was so decided (decision 39/305B).

69. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to document A/39/852, which has just been circulated, containing a note by the Secretary-General on agenda item 17 (*i*), relating to the confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

70. In his note the Secretary-General indicates that he has not yet reached a stage in his consultations where he can present a name for the post under consideration. He intends to continue consultations, however, in the hope of being in a position to present a name early in 1985.

71. In the interim period, the Secretary-General will appoint a senior Deputy Secretary-General of UNCTAD to act as its officer-in-charge.

72. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of the information contained in the note from the Secretary-General?

It was so decided (decision 39/324A).

73. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): I just want to say a brief word, on behalf of the Group of 77, with respect to the decision just taken by the General Assembly. We would like to express our appreciation for the efforts of the Secretary-General to appoint a Secretary-General of UNCTAD. We understand the situation in which the Secretary-General has found himself, but the Group of 77, which for obvious reasons attaches special importance to the proper functioning of UNCTAD, would like to see that office of the head of UNCTAD filled as soon as possible.

74. The present arrangement, we understand, is inevitable, but at the same time it is obvious that such an important organ should be able to function with a head that would have all the possible and necessary requirements to enable him to function properly and satisfactorily. Therefore, we are hopeful that this very important post will be filled in the very near future, as in fact suggested in the document before us.

75. I take this opportunity also to offer special praise to Mr. Corea, who, for more than 10 years, devoted all his time and effort to the functioning of UNCTAD. In wishing him success in whatever other post he may occupy, I wish to place on record the gratitude of the Group of 77 for all he has done for UNCTAD and for the developing countries during his long tenure of service.

76. Mr. WANG Baoliu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): We have noted the Secretary-General's provisional arrangement with respect to the post of Secretary-General of UNCTAD. In his term of office as Secretary-General of UNCTAD, Mr. Corea made outstanding contributions to the promotion of international trade and development, to the safeguarding of the rights and interests of the developing countries, and to the establishment of a new international economic order. As his term of office comes to an end, I wish on behalf of the Chinese delegation to express to him our admiration and gratitude. It is our hope that the question of the post of UNCTAD Secretary-General will soon be settled satisfactorily.

77. Pending the appointment of a new UNCTAD Secretary-General, we also hope that, under the leadership of a Deputy Secretary-General, UNCTAD will move forward and exert a positive, useful influence on the international economy.

78. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, it is an honour for me to make the following statement.

79. In connection with the consideration of the note of the Secretary-General [*A/39/852*] concerning the appointment of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, the delegations of the socialist countries for whom I am speaking regret the fact that UNCTAD will temporarily be without a proper head. We hope that that period will be as short as possible and that a

---

*Resumed from the 98th meeting.

candidate for the post of UNCTAD Secretary-General will soon be confirmed. UNCTAD has won the respect of a majority of Members of the United Nations for its important work in the field of trade and development. If it is to enjoy further success, UNCTAD must have an authoritative leader who enjoys the broad support of the Member States.

80. On behalf of the aforementioned socialist countries, I also take this opportunity to thank Mr. Gamani Corea, who has successfully headed UNCTAD for a number of years. I wish him good health and further success in his efforts to strengthen the principles of equality, justice and democracy in the field of international trade and development.

81. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Group of African States, I wish to say that we take note of the Secretary-General's intention to continue consultations relating to the appointment of a Secretary-General of UNCTAD. We also share his hope that appointing one of the Deputy Secretaries-General of the Conference to act as officer-in-charge will indeed be in UNCTAD'S interests. Our group attaches great importance to UNCTAD. This is a point that has just been made by the representative of Egypt, Chairman of the Group of 77.

82. At this juncture we wish to assure the Secretary-General of the Group of African States' full co-operation in whatever consultations he holds on the appointment of a new UNCTAD Secretary-General.

83. Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): The Group of Western European and other States has taken note of the new document and has no objection to it. Indeed, we are confident that the Secretary-General will conduct those consultations successfully.

84. Let me also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the departing Secretary-General of UNCTAD, Mr. Gamani Corea, who for more than a decade has played an important part in our work within the framework of the North-South dialogue. He has been an outstanding personality both because of his functions as head of UNCTAD and because of his personal qualifications. His name will always be associated with the major UNCTAD conferences and achievements of the past decade. As one example, I might mention the Common Fund for Commodities. It was always a pleasure to listen to him, and one had to admire his eloquence and his inspiring and sometimes unorthodox ideas. This kind of inspiration is needed, and this ability to inspire is part of the qualifications for leadership.

85. At this stage, it is for all of us to express our appreciation and gratitude to Mr. Corea for his tireless efforts to foster the dialogue and co-operation between developing and developed countries to which we all remain committed. We hope that in the future as well, the international community will have the benefit of his advice.

86. Mr. HENAR (Suriname): On behalf of the Group of Latin American States, I should like to express our great appreciation and gratitude to Mr. Corea for the efforts he has made and for the valuable work he has done in his capacity as Secretary-General of UNCTAD. Mr. Corea, whose term is nearly at an end, will leave UNCTAD at the end of this month.

87. It is regrettable that the United Nations has not yet been in a position to appoint a successor to Mr. Corea. We take note of the communication that consultations with regional groups have, unfortunately, not yet reached the stage where a nomination to this very important post can be presented. We are confident, however, that the provisional arrangement by the Secretary-General to appoint a senior Deputy Secretary-General of UNCTAD to act as officer-in-charge will be successful, and that a successor to Mr. Corea will soon be appointed.

88. May I conclude by thanking Mr. Corea once more, on behalf of the Group of Latin American States, and wishing him well and success for the future.

89. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the Group of Asian States, I wish to express our deepest appreciation for the excellent services rendered by Mr. Corea, Secretary-General of UNCTAD and to extend our best wishes to him.

90. We agree with the Chairman of the Group of 77, who stressed the importance of UNCTAD's work, particularly for the developing countries, as well as the importance of providing UNCTAD with all possible services so that it may continue to function without interruption.

91. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now turn its attention to document A/39/832, containing a note by the Secretary-General on agenda item 17(*j*), relating to the appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia.

92. In his note, the Secretary-General proposes the extension of the appointment of Mr. Brajesh Chandra Mishra as United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for a one-year term beginning on 1 January 1985.

93. May I take it that the General Assembly approves this proposal?

It was so decided (decision 39/325).

AGENDA ITEM 25

The situation in Central America: Threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)*

94. The PRESIDENT: May I propose that agenda item 25, relating to the situation in Central America, be retained on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session of the Assembly?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

AGENDA ITEM 38

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development

95. The PRESIDENT: Members are aware that the subject of global negotiations has been before the General Assembly ever since the adoption of resolution 34/138 on 14 December 1979, five years ago. Since then, the question of global negotiations has been the subject of intensive discussions and consultations in a wide variety of forums and at various levels, including that of Heads of State and Govern-

---

*Resumed from the 39th meeting.

ment. Those in themselves testify to the importance Member States attach to the issue.

96. Most recently, during the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, there were detailed and serious consultations between the various interested parties, with the active encouragement of my predecessor, Mr. Jorge Enrique Illueca, and the able assistance of Mr. Mohamed Sahnoun of Algeria, in his capacity as a Vice-President entrusted by Mr. Illueca with the task of conducting, in his absence, informal consultations on this item.

97. Despite these strenuous efforts, members will recall that the President of the thirty-eighth session reported, on the closing day of the Assembly, 17 September 1984, that "Regrettably, it has not been possible to make further substantive progress on this occasion." [*See 106th meeting, para. 16.*] He then proposed, and the Assembly agreed, that the item be included in the agenda of the thirty-ninth session.

98. Since assuming office as President of the thirty-ninth session, I have given this matter considerable thought, and I have also engaged in informal consultations with various interested delegations.

99. On 23 October 1984, I requested one of our Vice-Presidents, Mr. Azraai Zain of Malaysia, to undertake on my behalf informal consultations on this agenda item with delegations. Mr. Zain has subsequently informed me of the results of those informal consultations. While I believe it is the desire of all parties to make progress, it has become clear to me that too little time has elapsed since the final rounds of consultations which were conducted by my predecessor to realistically expect any movement to have occurred on this complex but vital issue. Moreover, the last months have also been particularly busy for many delegations with other equally urgent issues.

100. In these circumstances, I should like to state the following: First, I wish to remind all Member States of the continuing validity of the concept of the commitment of the General Assembly to global negotiations as embodied in resolution 34/138, which was adopted by consensus. Secondly, I wish to address an appeal to all Member States to take stock seriously of the current situation and to renew their efforts and their commitment to co-operate in the spirit of mutual accommodation and flexibility and in the interest of the international community as a whole, so as to launch global negotiations at the earliest practicable date. I will remain available for any consultations or any initiative which Member States may wish to propose. Thirdly, I wish to propose that the item "Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development" be held in abeyance in order to allow for the continuation of informal consultations. At the same time, I propose that the Assembly authorize me, in the light of developments and of such consultations, to re-convene the session at an opportune time. If I hear no objection to this proposal, it will be so decided.

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

101. The PRESIDENT: I should like at this point to pay tribute to Mr. Zain for the efficient manner in which he carried out the consultations in spite of his other heavy responsibilities.

102. May I therefore propose that agenda item 38 be kept open, in order to allow for the continuation of informal consultations after the suspension of the session, and that the Assembly reconvene on short notice to consider any decisions or agreements that might emerge from the negotiations?

It was so decided (decision 39/454 A).

AGENDA ITEM 39

Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council

103. The PRESIDENT: I understand that there is no request to consider this item at the present session. If this is the case, may I take it that the Assembly decides to include the item in the provisional agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided (decision 39/455).

AGENDA ITEM 41

Observance of the quincentenary of the discovery of America

104. The PRESIDENT: In this connection, I have received a request that this item be kept on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session in order to allow for further consultations. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to retain this item on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

AGENDA ITEM 42

Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General

105. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Assembly will recall that on 21 September 1984 [*3rd meeting, paras. 141 and 143*], the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the present session but deferred a decision on the allocation of the item to an appropriate time in the future. It is my understanding that it would be desirable to leave the question of Cyprus open at the present session. May I take it that the General Assembly agrees to that understanding and decides to retain the item on the agenda of its thirty-ninth session?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

AGENDA ITEM 43

Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations

106. The PRESIDENT: I have received a request to the effect that this item be retained on the agenda of the current session. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to retain this item on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

AGENDA ITEM 44

Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq

107. The PRESIDENT: In this connection, I have received a request that this item be kept on the agenda of the current session. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to retain this item on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

AGENDA ITEM 140

Celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in the British Empire

108. The PRESIDENT: I have received a request that this item be kept on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session in order to allow for further consultations. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to retain this item on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

AGENDA ITEM 126

Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations (*concluded*)*

109. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of Members to document A/39/849, containing a letter from the Chairman of the Group of Latin American States relating to the membership of the Special Committee. In accordance with that communication, the following countries will withdraw from membership of the Special Committee in 1985: Argentina, Brazil and Chile. The following countries have been endorsed by the group to replace them: Nicaragua, Panama and Peru. On the basis of that communication, I have appointed Nicaragua, Panama and Peru as members of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations with effect from 1 January 1985. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of this appointment?

It was so decided (decision 39/326).

AGENDA ITEM 129

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries (*concluded*)*

110. The PRESIDENT: I draw the attention of representatives to documents A/39/850 and A/39/851 from the Chairman of the Group of African States and the Chairman of the Group of Latin American States, respectively, relating to the membership of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries.

111. In accordance with document A/39/850, the Group of African States has endorsed Nigeria to replace Benin, which has decided to withdraw from membership of the *Ad Hoc* Committee in 1985. In accordance with the communication contained in document A/39/851, Guyana will also withdraw from membership of the *Ad Hoc* Committee in 1985, and Haiti has been endorsed by the Group of Latin American States to replace it.

112. On the basis of those communications, I have appointed Haiti and Nigeria as members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, with effect from 1 January 1985. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of this appointment?

It was so decided (decision 39/327).

AGENDA ITEM 55

Relationship between disarmament and development: report of the Disarmament Commission (*concluded*)**

113. The PRESIDENT: The next pending appointment refers to agenda item 55. Under this item, the General Assembly adopted resolution 39/160.

114. In paragraph 3 of that resolution, the Assembly decided to set up a Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, composed of 54 members.

115. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to entrust its President with the task of appointing the members of the Committee?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 69

Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations (*concluded*)**

116. The PRESIDENT: Next we come to appointments relating to agenda item 69. Under this item the General Assembly adopted resolution 39/158.

117. In paragraph 2 of that resolution, the President was requested, as a matter of urgency, to undertake consultations with the regional groups to appoint 54 Member States, on the basis of equitable geographical representation and including the Permanent Members of the Security Council, for membership of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

118. In compliance with that request, I shall proceed with the necessary consultations and announce the appointments as soon as possible.

---

*Resumed from the 99th meeting.

**Resumed from the 102nd meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 31

Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*concluded*):*

(a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;

(b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

(c) Report of the Secretary-General

119. The PRESIDENT: In connection with agenda item 31, I have been informed by two delegations of their desire to become members of the Special Committee against *Apartheid.*

120. I remind members that in its resolution 34/93 R of 17 December 1979, the General Assembly requested "the President of the General Assembly, in consultation with the regional groups, to expand the membership of the Special Committee, bearing in mind the principle of equitable geographical distribution".

121. Taking into account this provision, it will be necessary to hold further consultations before the Assembly takes a decision on this subject.

122. May I take it that it is the intention of the Assembly to entrust the President with pursuing this matter in the light of the provision of General Assembly resolution 34/93 R which I have just quoted?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 18

Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*concluded*):**

(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

123. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): As you know, Mr. President, Papua New Guinea's application for membership of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has been before the Assembly since the beginning of the session and has been on the agenda for some time.

124. Since there is apparently no objection on the part of any delegation here to our becoming a member, may I be advised when the decision on our application will be taken?

125. The PRESIDENT: I have received several communications from Member States, including Papua New Guinea, expressing the desire to be appointed members of the Special Committee.

126. As it will be necessary to proceed to hold further consultations on this matter, may I consider that it is also the wish of the Assembly to entrust the President with this task?

It was so decided.

127. The PRESIDENT: I have taken note of the statement of the representative of Papua New Guinea, and I assure him that I shall actively continue consulting the regional groups, with a view to making an appointment as soon as possible. I believe that he will understand, in a spirit of co-operation, the problem that I face at present.

The meeting was suspended at 5:30 p.m. and resumed at 5:45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 115

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*)***

128. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider part I of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 115, concerning the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations. Part I of the report is contained in document A/39/844.

129. The recommendation of the Fifth Committee appears in paragraph 17 of the report in the form of a draft resolution entitled "Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations".

130. The Assembly will first take action on the draft resolution. The Fifth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/247).

131. The PRESIDENT: I now wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to paragraph 15 of the report of the Fifth Committee. The Committee decided to recommend postponement of further consideration of this agenda item to the resumed session of the General Assembly. May I take it therefore that the General Assembly wishes to retain this item on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session?

It was so decided (see decision 39/456).

Programme of work

132. The PRESIDENT: In the light of the action already taken at its 104th meeting, as well as action taken at the present meeting, the General Assembly has decided to resume its thirty-ninth session at a date to be announced, for the sole purpose of considering the following agenda items: item 11, "Report of the Security Council"; item 12, "Report of the Economic and Social Council" (draft resolution on consumer protection); item 17 (*i*), "Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development"; item 25, "The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives"; item 38, "Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development"; item 41, "Observance of the

---

*Resumed from the 99th meeting.

** Resumed from the 100th meeting.

***Resumed from the 3rd meeting.

quincentenary of the discovery of America"; item 42, "Question of Cyprus"; item 43, "Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations"; item 44, "Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq"; item 81 (*j*), "Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund and allocation of the remaining balance"; item 110, "Programme planning"; item 115, "Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations"; and item 140, "Celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in the British Empire" [*decision 39/456*]. With those exceptions, therefore, we have concluded our consideration of all the items on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session.

Statement by the President

133. The PRESIDENT: Three months ago, on 18 September [*1st meeting*], when I assumed the responsibility of presiding over the work of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, I suggested that what was required at that critical juncture was a time to pause, to reflect deeply and to re-evaluate the direction in which we ought to move if the Organization was to regain its credibility and full acceptance. I observed also that the effort to build this structure of peace required our collective commitment and sustained support.

134. Although, as we have just decided, a few outstanding issues on our agenda will be taken up at a later date, we should ask ourselves today to what extent we have enhanced the credibility of the United Nations.

135. Each of us in this Hall will assess the work of the session on the basis of our respective national policies and perceptions of the Organization, as well as from the perspective of failures and successes. However, the correct yardstick of any objective assessment should be based on the Charter of the United Nations itself. We should therefore ask ourselves whether in terms of the Charter we have achieved any of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world, whom, after all, we represent.

136. In the course of this session of the General Assembly we have witnessed significant changes and developments, both internationally and within these walls. As we opened the session, we all expressed concern regarding the relations that existed between the two super-Powers. It was pertinent that Member States, expressing the yearnings of the peoples of the world, should appeal to the two super-Powers to resume dialogue and pursue negotiations with a view to halting the development, improvement and stockpiling of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems.

137. I am gratified that the initial steps in responding to this universal appeal were taken in this building. Since then, we have witnessed efforts being made to lift the dark clouds that have hung over relations between the two super-Powers. While it may be premature to determine the outcome of this trend, we can all express the fervent hope that the coming year, the fortieth anniversary of the Organization, will be marked as a year in which a major breakthrough was made in developing effective communication between the two super-Powers.

138. I am sure that we are all encouraged by the decision of the United States and the Soviet Union to resume dialogue on arms control and disarmament at the Foreign Ministers' level at Geneva early in the New Year. Even though we are all aware of the obstacles in any effort to tackle strategic arms limitation and total nuclear disarmament, we hope that some progress will be made at these meetings. Even if the achievement of a framework of understanding to resume serious negotiations on the limitation, freezing and control of nuclear weapons should elude us, we may, none the less, derive some satisfaction if the super-Powers can at least maintain dialogue and begin the process of restoring the spirit of détente which in the past contributed to an atmosphere of relaxation of international tension.

139. The present session of the Assembly adopted a record number of resolutions on disarmament. This underlines the continuing concern of the international community over the escalating arms race and the threat it poses to mankind. In this connection, I am most grateful to the Secretary-General for the important and timely statement he made to the Assembly on 12 December on the question of disarmament [*97th meeting, paras. 292 to 307*]. I share the views he expressed in that statement and join him in his appeal to the super-Powers to undertake urgent measures with a view to promoting agreements on all aspects of disarmament.

140. A new spirit seems to have prevailed at this session of the General Assembly. I know all members have observed that delegations have shown more readiness to accommodate and harmonize their views with others taking divergent positions. This is as it should be if we are to strengthen the capacity of the Organization to tackle the many urgent issues of our time. There has unquestionably been a determined effort to search for common ground and a convergence of views.

141. I dare to draw that conclusion in spite of the unfortunate developments of the last few days over certain issues. Unless we strive to maintain proper balance, we run the risk of allowing that occurrence to cloud our perspective of the general sweep of events during the present session. Indeed, I would be remiss in carrying out my responsibility as President of the Assembly if I failed to remind all delegations that it is in the nature of parliamentary diplomacy that this or that Government may find it difficult at times to secure majority support for its own point of view. In this context, it is of the utmost importance that we turn away from the easy temptation to condemn, disparage or minimize the efficacy of the Assembly when we are unable to prevail.

142. As is the case for most truly deliberative bodies, whether here, in the Assembly, or in national legislatures, parties and Governments have often employed parliamentary strategies and tactics to secure their particular goals. Obviously such practices, particularly when they succeed, appear disconcerting to those whose aims have been frustrated by them. But we must maintain some balance and proportion in that perception, realizing that none of us, in the past 39 years of the existence of the United Nations, has been blameless regarding the use of the rules of procedure to maximize support. Perhaps the time has come when we should exercise maximum restraint in viewing our voting proceedings in terms of a diplomatic or political scorecard. In this context, it would clearly be advisable to develop methods for moving away from postures where voting in the Assembly is seen in terms of gaining or losing. Such

postures are not helpful, and more often than not they are counter-productive.

143. While certain decisions may not have been comfortable to this or that Government, we all must have gained some satisfaction from the constructive approach taken by the General Assembly in at least two broad areas. Despite the wide divergence of views on some key points, the Assembly was able to adopt by consensus the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. This new Convention is yet another symbol of faith in the dignity and worth of the human person. We have, in that document, realized the dreams of many of our fellow human beings in various parts of the world where torture is practiced.

144. Equally gratifying is the painstaking manner in which Member States were able to reach a consensus on the critical economic situation in Africa. By dint of perseverance, compromise and flexibility, an agreed position was reached. The political processes which culminated in the adoption by consensus of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa testified to the validity of interdependence and to the ability of the United Nations to provide prescriptions for many of the problems which confront the nations of the world.

145. Regrettably, we have been unable to employ that same strength, that same unifying element of multilateral diplomacy, for the purpose of launching the long overdue global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development. Despite the intensive and detailed exploratory process which had been successfully concluded earlier in the year and which had been characterized by an atmosphere of mutual understanding and goodwill, no substantive progress has been possible since then.

146. Yet I do not consider this a total failure, nor would I place it in the debit column of the bookkeeping exercise of this thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. On the contrary, I see it as an opportunity to renew our efforts and our commitment in the spirit of accommodation and flexibility. Indeed, as a result of the adoption of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, a new momentum in multilateralism has been created, one which, I hope, will in the not too distant future take us over the last hurdle which has stood in the way and has delayed the launching of global negotiations.

147. In this context, it is pertinent to recall the long and often stormy voyage which eventually took us to a successful conclusion of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. By 10 December 1984, that Convention had received 159 signatures, including those of the members of the European Community. The way has thus been paved for a more rational exploration and exploitation of the resources of the international sea-bed area for the benefit of all mankind.

148. Encouraging developments on the international scene as well as at the United Nations have, regrettably, been accompanied by other, disappointing and frustrating, events. First and foremost, we must all deplore the increase in violence and terrorism which have plagued the international community in recent months. Recent hijackings and the killing of diplomats—and, in one case, of an international civil servant—should prod Governments to take concerted action with a view to bringing an end to this terrible crime of terrorism. Here again, I wholeheartedly support the statement by the Secretary-General on this matter.

149. In my statement at the opening of the session, I asked whether it was not within our capacity to find just and lasting solutions to regional conflicts such as those in Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Central America, southern Africa and the Middle East. The decisions which we have since taken on those issues confirm once again that we are indeed capable of at least providing a framework or formula for resolving the conflicts. To the extent that these problems remain unresolved, we have had no choice but to reiterate virtually all the recommendations which we had made in previous sessions, recommendations concerning, among other things, the withdrawal of troops, the recognition of the rights of States and peoples, and the acceptance and implementation of broadly-based peace initiatives and plans.

150. In the context of the Middle East, the search for peace remains an essential responsibility of the United Nations. In the absence of a comprehensive and durable solution, this session of the General Assembly had no alternative but to review both the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine. That is why the Assembly reiterated once again that the question of Palestine is still at the core of the Middle East problem, and that a just and lasting solution should, above all, guarantee the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and nationhood.

151. I am conscious that the call made by the Organization for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East has not yet obtained the support of some of the parties concerned which would make it possible. In any case, I hope that all concerned will redouble their efforts to bring about a convergence of views on this matter.

152. As far as Namibia is concerned, we have not witnessed during this session any advance towards the independence of that Territory. On the contrary, we have seen in recent weeks the now familiar pattern of tempting prospects and a final let-down. We have long been led to believe that independence for Namibia was around the corner, but the continued insistence by South Africa on linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola shows clearly that we are a long way from the cherished goal of Namibia's freedom. It was, therefore, necessary and proper for the Assembly to reiterate its strong position that Namibia should be free and genuinely independent, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

153. In relation to *apartheid*, the Assembly conveyed to South Africa once again the international community's abhorrence of the inhuman policy of *apartheid*. The Assembly's message was loud and clear, that *apartheid* is an evil and inhuman system that must be eradicated, and that the Organization will not remain silent until racial discrimination and segregation in all their forms and manifestations are eliminated.

154. The rising tide of protests both inside and outside South Africa is a clear manifestation of the response of the oppressed people of South Africa and of the international community to the alarming increase in repression by the minority régime of South Africa against the black majority of its citizens. Perhaps it is the revulsion that peoples of the world express against *apartheid* that will begin to convince

those Governments which are at present reluctant to join the growing majority to take effective measures against this evil system.

155. I am certain that we are all cautiously optimistic about the prospect of a lasting solution of the Cyprus problem, which has been on our agenda for the last 20 years. The Secretary-General in his modesty has not claimed a diplomatic breakthrough, but those who have followed with keen interest his tireless efforts in carrying out his good offices will not fail to recognize that he has provided an important framework that may lead to a mutually acceptable agreement on the Cyprus problem.

156. At this stage of the work of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, I am fully aware that I owe you all a debt of profound gratitude. In the conduct of the proceedings of the Assembly you have demonstrated unfailing courtesy and understanding. Without your co-operation and willingness to accommodate one another, developments would have been much more difficult. I therefore wish to express my deep appreciation of the manner in which you have enabled the Assembly to go through its very long agenda.

157. This, the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, in spite of all its unresolved and unfinished business, has fulfilled some of the hopes of the peoples of the world. My message as President of the Assembly is still one of hope. Why should we slide back? Is it not better and safer to put our hope and trust in the United Nations than in the machines of war and mass destruction? We still have a choice.

158. Let me take this opportunity to express my thanks to all those who have been responsible for what we have been able to accomplish thus far: first to you, Mr. Secretary-General, and to your team of dedicated Secretariat staff, including of course my closest associate in the conduct of the Assembly, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, Mr. William Buffum, his staff, the interpreters and translators, editors, messengers, conference and press officers, and others. I am most grateful to them all for their invaluable contributions to the work of the Assembly.

159. I wish also to commend the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly, the Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the various main Committees, and of course the Chairmen of the regional groups, who have facilitated the smooth running of the session thus far.

160. As I stated on another occasion, everyone who is involved in the work of the United Nations in one capacity or another is a peace-maker.

161. I wish you all a joyous and peaceful New Year.

Suspension of the session

162. The PRESIDENT: I hereby declare the thirty-ninth session suspended.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

106th PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 9 April 1985,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

Resumption of the session

1. The PRESIDENT: I declare the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly resumed in accordance with General Assembly decision 39/456 of 18 December 1984.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and of Mr. Tom Adams, Prime Minister of Barbados

2. The PRESIDENT: It is my sad duty to recall to the General Assembly the deaths of Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and of Mr. Tom Adams, Prime Minister of Barbados, which occurred since the suspension of the thirty-ninth session of the Assembly on 18 December 1984.

3. I invite representatives to stand and observe a minute of silence in tribute to their memory.

The members of the Assembly observed a minute of silence.

AGENDA ITEM 115

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*)

4. The PRESIDENT: I invite the attention of the General Assembly to document A/39/883, which contains a letter addressed to me by the Secretary-General informing the Assembly that 13 Member States are in arrears in the payment of their financial contributions to the United Nations within the terms of Article 19 of the Charter.

5. I should like to remind delegations that, under Article 19 of the Charter,

> "A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years."

May I consider that the General Assembly duly takes note of that information?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Report of the Security Council (*concluded*)

6. The PRESIDENT: May I consider that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Security Council [*A/39/2*]?

It was so decided (decision 39/457).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*):*

(*a*) Report of the Council (chapters I, II, III (part I, sections D, F and G and part II, sections A to C and E to G), IV, V (sections A to C), VIII and IX (part I, sections D, E, J to N and Q));

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

7. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that in its decision 39/444, entitled "Consumer protection", the General Assembly decided to take note of the consensus reached, on an *ad referendum* basis, on a set of guidelines for consumer protection, and to consider the draft resolution annexed to that decision for adoption at a resumed session in 1985. May I take it that the Assembly now wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/248).

8. The PRESIDENT: I call now on delegations wishing to explain their position.

9. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): The consensus agreement on the consumer guidelines marks the end of a long road. This is an agreement that many thought impossible when we first began the journey, and there were points along the way when there was indeed real cause to doubt that a consensus text was possible. But perseverance and good will have prevailed.

10. My Government still has reservations, however, about both the concept and the specifics of these consumer guidelines. This should come as no surprise to anyone. We made this quite clear in Decem-

---

*Resumed from the 104th meeting.

ber of last year at the time we agreed to their adoption on an *ad referendum* basis.

11. Since then we have subjected the guidelines to an arduous examination, both within our Government and with representative groups of varying interests from many areas of American society. I can say in all sincerity that virtually no one who has studied these guidelines is overly pleased, but the overwhelming view seems to be that they represent a reasonable compromise and are therefore acceptable. At the same time, there is a strong feeling, on the part of my Government and a large majority of those interested groups which have followed this exercise and given us their views, that these guidelines represent the last step in this long process, and that they can indeed serve adequately to be what they are supposed to be, namely, guidelines for assisting countries, particularly developing countries, in their efforts to protect their consumers. Thus, I believe it is entirely fair to say that the work of the United Nations in this area is now concluded.

12. As we mentioned briefly last December, there are a number of things in these guidelines which continue to cause us problems and which we believe detract from their quality and potential usefulness. I should like to spell out here those areas where we maintain reservations, though not sufficient reservations to prevent our joining the consensus.

13. First, we would have very strongly preferred to see the guidelines speak throughout about unreasonable risks or hazards, and we interpret the risks or hazards mentioned in the guidelines to be only those that are unreasonable. We all regularly accept routine risk wherever we are, whether in our homes, at work or travelling from one place to another. Consumer protection efforts cannot be expected to deal with every conceivable risk we face, but rather only with those that are unreasonable. We believe this to be a most important point.

14. Secondly, we are not happy to see references in the document to specific products or industries. To single out a few, even such important ones as those mentioned, is to distort the picture. Many other product areas, too numerous to mention, might logically have been included. It would have been fairer and more balanced to omit mention of any specific products or industries, particularly when we consider that the relative importance of any product varies from country to country.

15. Thirdly, we believe the guidelines remain biased towards government intervention in the marketplace. We believe that self-regulatory mechanisms by business and the forces of free and competitive markets will generally prove to be the most effective means of protecting consumers and advancing their interests.

16. Fourthly, while the original language has been vastly improved, it is still possible that the guidelines might be used to justify protectionist measures or discrimination against foreign investors. This would be unfortunate and damaging to much-needed efforts to expand international trade. It is surely not what the guidelines are designed to do. All countries should take pains to ensure that the guidelines are not misused for protectionist purposes.

17. Finally, we remain dubious that the United Nations has a truly useful role to play in this and other similar efforts in the regulatory area. To join in the negotiations in the first place was a difficult decision for us. We believe that there are better ways of achieving the goals sought here and better things on which the United Nations should expend its limited resources and time. It is our view that the free flow of trade and investment offers the best means of meeting the interests of consumers. We have seen all too often the pernicious effects of excessive government controls and intervention in the marketplace. The principal beneficiaries of such regulation and control are all too often the regulators and controllers.

18. But, when all is said and done, we have, despite these many concerns, determined that the guidelines are an acceptable conclusion to our efforts, and that they do what they were meant to do—namely, offer useful guidance to countries in their own efforts to develop reasonable and useful programmes in consumer protection, appropriate to their particular circumstances.

19. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden): Sweden has always attached great importance to questions regarding consumer affairs. It was therefore with particular satisfaction that we joined other delegations in adopting by consensus the draft resolution annexed to decision 39/444.

20. The consumer guidelines approved today are the result of many years of hard work by delegations, government experts and the Secretariat. At the beginning of the thirty-ninth session the outlook for a consensus solution still seemed bleak. It is a tribute to the perseverance and the negotiating skills of the delegations most immediately concerned—we are particularly grateful to the representatives of Pakistan and the United States—that we could reach a basic agreement on the guidelines in December. Since then the internal process of approval within the United States has been concluded and it has thus been possible to reach the final step in approving the guidelines.

21. In my delegation's view, this resolution should be seen as one of the major accomplishments of the thirty-ninth session in the economic field. As they are followed up by action at national levels, the guidelines will in a very concrete way be of direct benefit to millions of consumers all over the world in their everyday life.

22. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): In the Second Committee, on 14 December last year, the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic made a joint statement on taking note of the achievement of consensus, on an *ad referendum* basis, on the draft resolution on consumer protection. Now our delegations consider it necessary to reaffirm their position of principle on the question of consumer protection, set forth in particular in the replies of our countries to the questionnaire sent by the Secretary-General.

23. We believe that the interrelationship between consumers and manufacturers of goods and services is an internal matter for States and should be resolved at the national level. This question becomes international in character only when it comes to matters of international trade in the context of

protecting the interests of developing countries as collective importers and consumers of goods and services. The work of the United Nations in this field is justified only if and when it promotes the defence and protection of the interests of the developing countries in the realm of international economic relations and also the protection of the broad working masses in the developing and developed capitalist countries against the dictates of transnational corporations.

24. We regret that the task of eliminating the ill effects of the activities of transnational corporations has not been reflected at all in this text of general principles or guidelines for consumer protection, although it did appear in all the previous versions of the document. The decision of some of the sponsors to yield to the pressure of certain delegations and to delete any reference to transnational corporations from the final text has led to a situation in which the whole idea of producing general guidelines for consumer protection has departed from reality, become very abstract in nature and virtually lost its initial significance. All of this, of course, inevitably changed our attitude towards this idea.

AGENDA ITEMS 12 AND 92

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*concluded*)

International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)*

25. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to part I of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 12, concerning the report of the Economic and Social Council; part I of the report of the Committee on item 12 deals also with item 92, concerning the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women. It is contained in document A/39/613. In paragraph 4 of that report, the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution entitled "Statute of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women". The Fifth Committee adopted it without objection. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/249).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):

(*g*) Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit

26. The PRESIDENT: I should now like to invite the attention of the Assembly to document A/39/881, dealing with a vacancy in the Joint Inspection Unit.

27. Even though the Assembly has already considered agenda item 17 (*g*), may I take it that the Assembly has no objection to reopening it in order to appoint one member of the Joint Inspection Unit at this meeting?

It was so decided.

28. The PRESIDENT: As indicated in document A/39/881, the General Assembly is required to appoint a person to fill a vacancy in the Joint Inspection Unit created by the death of Mr. Toman Hutagalung of Indonesia on 19 December 1984.

29. As a result of consultations, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, I now submit to the Assembly the candidacy of Mr. Kahono Martohadinegoro of Indonesia for appointment as member of the Joint Inspection Unit for a five-year term beginning on 9 April 1985 and expiring on 31 December 1989. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to appoint this candidate?

It was so decided (decision 39/305C).

AGENDA ITEM 38

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development (*continued*)

30. The PRESIDENT: Next, the Assembly will turn to agenda item 38. I suggest to the Assembly that this item be considered at our next plenary meeting this week. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 80

Development and international economic co-operation (*continued*):*

(*c*) Trade and development:

(i) Report of the Trade and Development Board;

(ii) Reports of the Secretary-General

31. The PRESIDENT: Next, I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to a note of 21 March 1985 contained in document A/39/867, in which the Secretary-General informed the Assembly that the United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships had requested him to seek the approval of the General Assembly at its resumed thirty-ninth session to resume the Conference for a period of two weeks in July 1985. May I take it that the General Assembly has no objection to reopening consideration of item 80 (*c*) in order to consider at this resumed session the request submitted by the Conference?

It was so decided.

---

*Resumed from the 101st meeting.

*Resumed from the 104th meeting.

32. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will consider this agenda item again as soon as the Fifth Committee has met on the programme budget implications of the proposed resumption.

AGENDA ITEM 81

Operational activities for development (*concluded*):

(*j*) Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund and allocation of the remaining balance: report of the Secretary-General

33. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will turn next to agenda item 81 (*j*). The Assembly, by its decision 39/456 of 18 December 1984, decided to consider this item at its resumed session. In this connection, the Assembly has before it the report of the Second Committee [*A/39/791*]. The recommendation of the Second Committee appears in paragraph 30 as draft decision IV entitled "Liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Fund and allocation of the remaining balance". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/458).

AGENDA ITEM 93

United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (*continued*):*

(*b*) Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women

34. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to document A/39/884, which contains a request addressed to me by the representatives of Argentina, Egypt, India, Indonesia and Kenya to seek the approval of the Assembly at its resumed thirty-ninth session to reopen agenda item 93 (*b*), entitled "Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women". May I take it that the General Assembly has no objection to reopening agenda item 93 (*b*) as requested?

It was so decided.

35. The PRESIDENT: There is no formal proposal at this stage. As soon as one is submitted, and if it appears to have programme budget implications, may I consider that the Assembly agrees that it be referred directly to the Fifth Committee?

It was so decided.

36. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will take up this item again at a later stage this week.

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.

---

*Resumed from the 101st meeting.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records

107th PLENARY MEETING
Friday, 12 April 1985, at 12.20 p.m.
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Enver Hoxha, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Labour Party and Chairman of the General Council of the Democratic Front of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania

1. The PRESIDENT: It is my sad duty to inform the Assembly of the death of Mr. Enver Hoxha, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Labour Party and Chairman of the General Council of the Democratic Front of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania.

2. On behalf of the General Assembly, I extend heartfelt condolences to the Government and people of Albania.

AGENDA ITEM 115

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*)

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the General Assembly's attention to document A/39/883/Add.1, which contains a letter addressed to me by the Secretary-General informing me that, since the issuance of his last communication [*A/39/883*], dated 9 April 1985, Saint Lucia has made the necessary payment to reduce its arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter. May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of this information?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 38

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development (*continued*)

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at its 106th meeting, the Assembly will now consider agenda item 38.

5. In my statement on 18 December 1984 [*105th meeting, para. 100*], I proposed, and the Assembly agreed, to keep agenda item 38 open in order to allow for the continuation of informal consultations after the suspension of the session and to reconvene on short notice to consider any decisions or agreements that might emerge from the consultations. Regrettably, nothing substantive has emerged from those consultations.

6. It is clear from the statements in the general debate at the thirty-eighth session and in discussions in the Second Committee and other bodies of the United Nations system that international co-operation for economic development is one of the essential prerequisites for the maintenance of international peace and security in all their aspects. It is also clear from the current international economic climate that the decision of 14 December 1979 to launch global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development [*resolution 34/138*] is perhaps even more valid today than it was five years ago.

7. The purposes of the Charter of the United Nations oblige us to continue to search for solutions to the economic problems which confront the nations of the world.

8. Allow me to go to the extent of suggesting that it would be an abrogation of Article 1, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter, especially during this year of the fortieth anniversary—a time for recommitment—if we were to abandon the search for the consensus which is required to launch the negotiations. It is in the interest of all States not only to keep alive the concept of global negotiations but also to make a determined effort to break the current stalemate.

9. I therefore once again propose to keep the agenda item open in order to allow for further informal, but intensive, consultations after the suspension of the session and to reconvene on short notice to consider any decisions or agreements that might emerge from the consultations. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided (decision 39/454 B).

10. The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of Egypt, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of 77, would like to make a statement, and I now call on him.

11. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): In this very Hall, many prominent speakers over the years have reiterated time and time again their commitment to the launching of global negotiations; and at certain junctures we were closer to reaching our goal. It is indeed regrettable and disappointing that, up to the present day, overall solemn commitments to work towards attaining the new international economic order have not been met.

12. This sad fact remains a source of deep concern for the Group of 77, which has initiated the idea of global negotiations in the firm conviction that it offers a positive and coherent response to the growing complexity of international economic relations and draws its support from the principles of mutual benefit, solidarity and interdependence.

13. The crisis which still besets the world economy, with its acute manifestations particularly in the developing world, confirms to our mind the continued validity of the idea of global negotiations for bringing about a peaceful restructuring of international economic relations.

14. The Group of 77 has consistently reaffirmed its full commitment to global negotiations, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/138, and has always maintained a flexible approach in its persistent endeavours to bring about an early launching of those negotiations. Unfortunately, this spirit has not so far been reciprocated by our partners, and it is indeed regrettable that, at a time when interdependence is more compelling, we find ourselves in a situation where our partners are shying away from joining with us in a genuine and meaningful dialogue that is aimed, after all, at promoting the interests of all countries and is based on the principles of justice, equality and mutual benefit. We all face a challenge that needs all hands to be joined together in order for it to be met forthrightly and resolutely.

15. The developing countries intend to continue to pursue their efforts to reach, in co-operation with the developed countries, a common conceptual approach aimed at taking the necessary measures for coping with the structural interrelated problems confronting the world. We continue to believe that this common approach can be attained only through a process of constructive dialogue that recognizes the global character of the problems involved. We see in the continued deadlock in sectoral negotiations further proof of the continued validity of the concept of global negotiations which is predicated on the need for an integrated and simultaneous approach that would consider the full range of questions in the major spheres of international economic relations in terms of their interrelationship.

16. Almost 40 years after its inception, the United Nations is still facing the challenge of realizing the full potential of international co-operation. You rightly reminded us, Mr. President, of the relevant Charter provisions and we equally want to reiterate that we firmly believe that the United Nations is an effective instrument for the achievement of progress for the international community as a whole. This is why, as we approach its fortieth anniversary, we are in the forefront in defending its role and remain wedded to our conviction that the United Nations system is uniquely and solely capable of devising formulas that could translate interdependence into concrete steps that could progressively achieve prosperity, stability and peace for all mankind.

17. Mr. President, we thank you for your efforts and understand the considerations that prompted you to make your statement on this issue before us. For its part, the Group of 77 will continue to give you full support and constant co-operation in your consultations to bring about the necessary conditions for launching global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development.

18. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): At the outset, I too should like to extend profound condolences to the delegation of Albania on the death of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Albanian Labour Party, Enver Hoxha.

19. I am speaking on behalf of the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

20. The delegations of our countries consistently and unswervingly favour the prompt beginning of global negotiations at the United Nations, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/138.

21. The position of principle of the socialist States in supporting this initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of the Group of 77 has been expressed many times at the highest levels of leadership of our countries in documents of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

22. Our readiness to proceed immediately to the process of reaching agreement in the United Nations on issues regarding the practical preparation of global negotiations was once again reaffirmed by the joint statement of the delegations of the socialist countries made in plenary at the resumed thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly on 17 September 1984 [*106th meeting, paras. 40-47*]. That position remains fully in force.

23. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Italy, who will speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

24. Mr. ZUCCONI (Italy): I should like first of all, on behalf of my delegation, to express to the delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania sincere condolences on the death of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Albanian Labour Party.

25. The European Community and its member States have listened to the statement of the Chairman of the Group of 77 and will consider it in the light of their position on this matter. The Community and its member States have always participated actively and constructively in the North-South dialogue, in all forums in which such dialogue has taken place, with a view to achieving concrete results wherever possible. We have done so, and intend to continue our efforts in that direction, because we recognize the increasing degree of interdependence between different countries and areas in the world economy and the consequences that economic policies pursued by individual countries or groups of countries have for developments in other parts of the world. The European Community, moreover, has a number of specific reasons to be particularly conscious of world economic interdependence.

26. First, its member States have widespread and diverse traditional links with many countries and regions of the world. The Community itself has developed an extensive network of relations, including trade and co-operation agreements, with a large number of individual countries and regional groupings throughout the world.

27. Secondly, about 40 per cent of the Community's external trade takes place with developing countries, which provide about 40 per cent of total Community imports.

28. Thirdly, the Community is convinced that its future prospects for economic growth and successful structural adjustment are very much interwoven with further economic development in the developing

countries and their more effective participation in the open world economy.

29. In fact, we believe that the North-South dialogue is of great value, as it permits the international community to build up elements of common understanding among all interested parties which, in time, can lead to fruitful results in terms of impact on individual policies, consultation, co-operation and, ultimately, negotiated agreements. This attitude towards the dialogue as a whole is reflected in the position of the European Community on the launching of global negotiations, on a basis acceptable to all, as we have expressed on many occasions. The European Community will continue to be guided by a constructive and co-operative spirit in the ongoing dialogue with the developing countries.

30. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): My Government, together with many others represented here, has devoted a considerable amount of time to the effort at achieving agreement on a basis for launching global negotiations. We will maintain our constructive and co-operative interest in this issue and will continue to play a full and active role in this process.

AGENDA ITEM 80

Development and international economic co-operation (*concluded*):

(*c*) Trade and development:

(i) Report of the Trade and Development Board;

(ii) Reports of the Secretary-General

31. The PRESIDENT: In connection with item 80 (*c*) the Assembly has before it draft resolution A/39/L.46, entitled "United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships", and the report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution [*A/39/886*].

32. I call on the representative of Egypt in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of 77.

33. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): On behalf of the Group of 77, I wish to address the question relating to the reconvening of the United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships.

34. As stipulated in the note by the Secretary-General of 21 March 1985 [*A/39/867*], the Conference, at its resumed session held at Geneva from 28 January to 15 February 1985, adopted a resolution by which it decided unanimously to request the General Assembly to convene a resumed session of the Conference for a period of two weeks in July 1985. The unanimous support of that resolution shows the significant progress achieved during the resumed session in January-February 1985, and it is our sincere hope in the light of that progress that the momentum will be maintained in order to bring about a successful conclusion to the Conference's work on the adoption of an international agreement on conditions for registration of ships.

35. In the aforementioned resolution, the Secretary-General was requested to seek the approval of the General Assembly at its resumed thirty-ninth session for the resumption of the Conference. We have submitted a draft resolution on the subject in document A/39/L.46 to formalize the agreement reached at Geneva concerning the resumption of the Conference in July.

36. On behalf of the Group of 77, I wish to express the earnest hope that draft resolution A/39/L.46, on which an understanding has been reached in the Fifth Committee along the same lines as the resolution adopted by the Conference, will receive the same unanimous support.

37. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/39/L.46?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/213 B).

AGENDA ITEM 93

United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (*concluded*):

(*b*) Preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women

38. The PRESIDENT: In connection with this item, I wish to draw the Assembly's attention to draft decision A/39/L.47 and the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/39/887*] on the programme budget implications of that draft decision. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft decision A/39/L.47?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/459).

39. The PRESIDENT: The adoption of that decision reaffirms the commitment of all delegations to spare no effort for the success of the conference to be held at Nairobi. Consultations should start as soon as possible to pave the way for the early completion of all the documentation, in particular the forward-looking strategies to be adopted by the conference. This, no doubt, will be the major preoccupation of the preparatory body. I feel sure that the preparatory body will have the wisdom to utilize available arrangements in the most flexible and expeditious way in order to achieve our common objective of success for the Nairobi conference.

40. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): As was made clear in the course of deliberations in the Fifth Committee, the resumption of the session of the preparatory body for the conference in New York involves a departure from General Assembly resolution 31/140, which stipulates that United Nations organs should meet at their respective established headquarters—in this case, in Vienna.

41. My delegation regrets the departure from the General Assembly's conference servicing regulations that the resumption of the session in New York entails. It is only in view of the particular circumstances of this case and the overriding need to ensure a successful outcome of the world conference to be held at Nairobi that my delegation accepts this decision.

42. My delegation hopes that the resumed session in New York will be successful in providing the conference with a substantive and forward-looking basis for its work.

AGENDA ITEM 110

Programme planning (*concluded*):*

(*a*) Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;

(*b*) Reports of the Secretary-General

43. The PRESIDENT: As members of the General Assembly will recall, the Assembly decided at its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1984, that agenda item 110, concerning programme planning, should be held open for consideration at a resumed session [*see decision 39/456*] after appropriate review and analysis had been completed. In this connection, the Assembly has before it the report of the Fifth Committee contained in document A/39/840. In paragraph 14 of the report, the Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of two draft decisions, I and II.

44. In regard to draft decision I, entitled "Correction to General Assembly resolution 38/227 A", following extensive informal consultations, a new draft decision has been submitted to replace it. The new draft decision is contained in document A/39/L.48.

45. I call now on Mr. Ernest Besley Maycock of Barbados, who wishes to introduce that draft decision.

46. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados): At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December last, the General Assembly decided that agenda item 110 should be held open for consideration at a resumed session. Subsequently, informal consultations were held within an open-ended contact group. An understanding emerged in the contact group that matters of substance were too important and too difficult to be dealt with in the time available and that such matters should be left for in-depth discussion during the forthcoming session of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and at the fortieth session of the General Assembly. According to the draft decision which I have the honour to introduce, the General Assembly, having considered the statement by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management before the Fifth Committee [*see A/C.5/39/SR.17, para. 46*], would decide to take note of the information and assurance provided by him. I hope that all delegations will find it possible to agree to the proposal in document A/39/L.48.

47. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft decision A/39/L.48?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/460).

48. The PRESIDENT: I call now on those delegations wishing to make statements after the decision. I remind representatives of the 10-minute time limit for such statements.

49. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil): It was our understanding that in resolution 38/227 A of 20 December 1983 the Secretary-General was requested to provide, *inter alia*, further indications of clear implications of draft resolutions with regard to the existing programmes within the relevant section of the programme budget, in the case of possible funding through existing resources. Therefore, we welcomed the information transmitted by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, referred to in document A/C.5/39/SR.17, paragraph 46, that in the editing and finalizing of the text of that resolution for submission to the Fifth Committee and to the General Assembly a plural form had been erroneously introduced into the expression "relevant section" in section II, paragraph 7 (*c*) (iii). We also welcomed his assurance that in the implementation of the said resolution the correct wording of the agreed text would be respected. We firmly trust that the matter will be treated as a clear mandate for the Secretary-General to act in the way that has been indicated.

50. Let me add that the initiative taken by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management in conveying this timely clarification of the matter reflects the professionalism and accuracy of the Secretariat in the discharge of its responsibilities and duties. We could not expect the Secretariat to do otherwise.

51. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): That the United States has joined in the consensus on the decision to take note of the statement by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management should in no way be construed as an agreement with the contents of that statement, which attempts to construe an agreement among delegations which, in our understanding, implied the use of the words "relevant sections", not "relevant section".

52. The PRESIDENT: I call now on the representative of Italy, who will speak on behalf of the States members of the European Community.

53. Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): The 10 States members of the European Community, on whose behalf I am speaking, agreed in a spirit of compromise to the adoption without a vote of draft decision A/39/L.48. We wish, however, to stress our position that that decision does not imply any approval on our part of the interpretation given by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management to section II, paragraph 7 (*c*) (iii) of General Assembly resolution 38/227 A.

54. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now turn to draft decision II recommended by the Fifth Committee and entitled "Amendments to the Financial Rules of the United Nations". The Committee adopted that draft decision without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 39/461).

AGENDA ITEM 115

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*)

55. The PRESIDENT: Members of the General Assembly will recall that at its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1984, the Assembly decided to postpone further consideration of agenda item 115, concerning the scale of assessments for the apportionment of expenses of the United Nations, to a resumed session of the General Assembly [*see decision 39/456*]. In this connection, the Assembly has before it part II of the report of the Fifth Committee on the item, which is contained in document A/39/844/Add.1. The recommendation of the Committee appears in paragraph 7 of the report in the

---

*Resumed from the 105th meeting.

form of a draft resolution entitled "Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations".

56. I call now on delegations wishing to make statements before a decision is taken, and I ask them to bear in mind the 10-minute time limit for such statements.

57. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): For a period of some years, the United States has participated in the deliberations of the Committee on Contributions and the Fifth Committee on the assessment process. We do so in a disinterested way, since our activities cannot affect, in one way or another, our assessed contribution to the United Nations budget. It is widely known that, as a result of action by both the United States Congress and the General Assembly, our proportionate share is fixed and, therefore, unaffected by this process. We have acted, instead, out of a principled interest in the well-being and future effectiveness of the United Nations, whose future we sincerely believe will be adversely affected if all countries do not share equitably in the burden of support for the Organization. Equitable burden-sharing has a direct effect on the Organization's willingness to pursue a course of fiscal responsibility and restraint, as well as on its dedication to effective use of its resources. Therefore, we are convinced that our decisions on this matter have an importance that transcends the issue of the precise level of each Member's contribution to the United Nations. Indeed, wrong decisions on this issue can have—will have—far-reaching consequences, affecting the very fabric of multilateralism.

58. My delegation has participated actively in the negotiations over the last several months. It has negotiated constructively and in good faith. Despite our strenuous efforts during those months, we regrettably find ourselves confronted with a document still marred by the provisions we found objectionable when the negotiations began. In my statement before the Fifth Committee last October [*see A/C.5/39/SR.9, paras. 25-35*], I indicated our serious concern that the current structure of the scale of assessments, with its numerous discounts and subsidies for various classes of countries, made it very difficult, if not impossible, to have equitable burden-sharing. The statement described our specific objections to two of the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions: the increase from $2,100 to $2,200 in the upper limit of the per capita income allowance for the least developed countries and the continuation of the 10-year base period. We indicated our strong belief that a more equitable system of assessment must be developed in the long term to avoid serious damage to the fiscal foundations of the United Nations system.

59. The document before us contains both of those objectionable provisions. Their intended effect is, of course, to reduce the contributions of some Member States. It also includes a number of provisions that go far beyond the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions in providing a welter of actual and potential discounts and subsidies. Rather than moving us towards the objective of a more equitable distribution of the financial burdens of the Organization, the multiplication of those *ad hoc* loopholes moves us further away from that goal.

60. The provision in paragraph 1 (*c*), for instance, implies that developing countries, no matter how prosperous, should not share fully in the costs of providing discounts to the least developed countries. How is this consistent with a fair implementation of the capacity-to-pay principle?

61. The provision in paragraph 1 (*d*) purports to benefit the least developed countries, but, as far as my delegation can discern, it changes not a single assessment. What contribution do such illusory political palliatives make to increased fairness and fiscal responsibility?

62. The provisions in paragraph 3 further complicate the scale by adding a subsidy based on total national income. Paragraph 1 (*e*) invites the Committee on Contributions to devise a method for determining a scale even more complicated than the present one. Paragraph 1 (*f*) greatly limits the responsiveness of the assessment mechanism to changes in world economic conditions.

63. Do provisions such as those, which complicate, distort and rigidify the assessment process, provide incentives for countries to be concerned about the size, substance and priorities of the United Nations budget? Given the proliferation of discounts and subsidies arising from the most narrow and self-serving political interests, how are we to avoid increased politicization of a process that should be primarily technical in nature? How are we to stem the growing perception in the capitals and legislatures of many Member States that most of the States Members of the United Nations intend to give as little as possible and take as much as possible? Does it serve the interest of taxpayers in developed or developing countries to acquiesce in an assessment process that does not have incentives for responsibility and efficiency? Does it strengthen the future prospects of the United Nations to heighten the growing public concern and even cynicism about the Organization?

64. The draft resolution before us is based on the pessimistic notion that most States Members of the United Nations are permanently condemned to the status of underdevelopment. What does such a notion say about the efficacy of the United Nations contribution to development efforts? How does it reflect the efforts of developing countries themselves? How does it reflect the positive hopes the Organization is supposed to represent? Given its despairing premise, how will the adoption of this draft resolution increase public understanding of, and support for, the development assistance process?

65. Because of our strong belief that the draft resolution before us is not in the interest of the United Nations, the United States opposes its approval by this Assembly. In fact, its faults are so glaring that we find it hard to understand why most Member States seem prepared to adopt it by consensus. Member States publicly profess a determination to strengthen the United Nations. Yet this worthy objective is quickly set aside when critical decisions are to be made, and, instead, narrow and self-serving political calculations prevail. Why is it that States that claim to care so deeply about the Organization lack the courage and political will to oppose draft resolutions that they know will damage its effectiveness?

66. As the United Nations approaches the celebration of its fortieth anniversary, we should all be working together to put the Organization on a more constructive course and to stem the universally

acknowledged process of decline and ineffectiveness. Instead, the draft resolution before us reinforces the tendencies that have greatly contributed to the present crisis in the Organization.

67. The United States will work tirelessly, as we have done in the past, to encourage trends towards greater responsibility and more effectiveness. We are willing to join others who share the same views and objectives in seeking to make the Organization a more effective, stronger and more appreciated instrument for the well-being of all mankind. We deeply regret that the document before us does not move the United Nations in that direction, and therefore we find ourselves unable to participate in any decision to approve this draft resolution.

68. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada): The Canadian delegation would like to express its appreciation to the officers of the Fifth Committee, and in particular to Mr. Maycock for his splendid guidance and leadership, which enabled us to conclude the work on the scale of assessments. In seven years of negotiations in the General Assembly, this was among the most arduous, fraught, as it was, with the difficulties of many competing interests. In this sense we are encouraged by the outcome, because at the end of the day the spirit of moderation, generosity and good will prevailed, in the interest of the Organization as a whole, to further the unity that we all seek.

69. Yet I am left with a certain apprehension that future scales may become even more difficult, because we seem embarked on a course that increasingly departs from an objective determination of the capacity to pay. In this regard, subparagraphs (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*e*) and (*f*) of paragraph 1 represent distortions of the capacity-to-pay principle.

70. At the same time, we look forward to the study referred to in paragraph 3 to see whether that might reverse the current trend and provide a step towards a more objective and refined calculation of capacity to pay.

71. In conclusion, the United Nations cannot afford to see the scale of assessments become a matter that engenders acrimony and confrontation. We believe, therefore, that the best way to avoid that very real danger and to achieve a sharing of the burden that can be accepted by all Member States is to entrust the Committee on Contributions with the task for which it was created.

72. The PRESIDENT: The Fifth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/247 B).

73. The PRESIDENT: Several delegations have expressed the wish to speak after a decision has been made.

74. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt): I have the privilege and honour to speak on behalf of the Group of 77 on so important a matter as the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations.

75. Members of the Group of 77 joined the consensus and fully participated in the efforts to reach it. They spared no effort and made many concessions so that agreement could be reached.

76. This constructive approach came out of our deep concern for the subject, because we knew that the alternative would be worse. We were deeply involved in seven months of negotiations, while at the same time we were aware, and we are still aware, that, had anybody wanted to vote on this issue, it would have been the easiest course to follow. We did not even despair when our efforts sometimes were met with arrogance by some of the so-called hard-liners. Let me be candid and quote one of those hard-liners describing his position: "Those who have nothing to lose can afford to be hard-liners, and even unreasonable."

77. Our attitude, from the beginning, was different. We tried to reach an agreement and worked for it. We offered a whole range of concessions and formulations for the sake of that agreement. The outcome does not satisfy us, but we consciously decided to accept it as a consensus and go along with it. Had there been a vote we definitely would not be in a position to agree on such a text. It needs many improvements, even additions, deletions and substitutions.

78. Before going into the details of the matter, let me just mention one thing. Over the years we have seen many countries in arrears in the payment of their contributions, in accordance with Article 19 of the Charter. Many of these countries are developing countries that face real economic hardships that temporarily prevent them from making payments. In the rare case that a non-developing country fell within the scope of Article 19, it was either for political reasons or reasons of principle, so it is not fair to use the argument that the actual amounts involved are relatively small. If the relationship is established between the amounts involved and the wealth we see in some parts of the world, then the argument is true. But if the relationship is with most of the world—namely the developing countries—then the amounts are relatively huge.

79. Let me now go into the specifics of the matter.

80. First, we would have preferred a clearer resolution that spelled out the economic difficulties facing the world today—especially, and to a greater extent, by far, the developing countries; also, we wanted the resolution to spell out in clear, unambiguous terms that those problems facing the developing countries have to be addressed by the Committee on Contributions in the preparation of the next scale of assessments.

81. Secondly, we would have preferred that the resolution state that the methodology used to determine the real capacity of Member States to pay served a good purpose in the past, but that it is becoming increasingly inadequate at present, not to mention the future. It is inadequate for measuring the real capacity to pay, and it should be supplemented by further measures.

82. Thirdly, we would have liked a resolution that raised the gradient to 90 per cent, a resolution that stated that the redistribution of the burden of relief should not fall on the developing countries.

83. Fourthly, the resolution should have clearly mentioned that an additional methodology should be developed immediately to take into account in the second stage of the exercise, and before the mitigation process, the serious and deteriorating economic situation in developing countries, spelling out the most important components of this serious situation. However, we are confident that the resolution adopted instructs the Committee on Contributions to develop and apply the requested methodology in the

preparation of the next scale of assessments, thus satisfying the General Assembly's decision.

84. Fifthly, we think also that the resolution should have instructed the Committee on Contributions on how to modify scheme III, contained in paragraph 49 of its report [*A/39/11 and Con. 1*].

85. Sixthly, we should also like to draw attention to paragraph 1 (*d*) of the resolution, which, if interpreted by a twisted mind, could lead to some sort of discrimination against some of the least fortunate among us, namely the least-developed countries. Of course, the General Assembly never did and does not now or in the future intend to discriminate against those countries.

86. Seventhly and lastly, we should have liked the resolution not to be selective, mentioning some studies by name, as it did in paragraph 2.

87. In its preambular and operative parts, the resolution speaks of bringing to the attention of the Committee on Contributions the elements of the discussion of this subject in the Fifth Committee. I expect—indeed demand—that this statement also be brought to the attention of the Committee on Contributions. We expect the Committee on Contributions to take into account, in all phases of its work, including the mitigation phase, all the points mentioned during the discussion of this item in the Fifth Committee and in plenary meeting.

88. Mr. RYDZKOWSKI (Poland): The Polish delegation would like to explain its position with regard to the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly, and to put the following on record.

89. While we have joined in the consensus, we wish to restate once again before the General Assembly Poland's position of principle with regard to the assessment for our country for the United Nations regular budget. In doing so we reiterate our request that the matter be finally and satisfactorily resolved during the revision of the scale this year.

90. May I recall that on 17 December 1982, in the plenary Assembly, the representative of Poland, while supporting the scale of assessments for the years 1983, 1984 and 1985, stated, *inter alia:*

> ". . . we should like to make it crystal-clear that my country, despite the substantial decrease in the new scale, continues to be over-assessed . . .
>
> "Guided by a spirit of compromise, accommodation and moderation, and despite our well-known financial and economic difficulties, Poland has found it possible to accept the new scale of assessments on the condition that during the next revision of the scale our contribution will be corrected downward so as to be in agreement with our real capacity to pay."[1]

This position remains fully valid.

91. We expect that the Committee on Contributions and, later, the General Assembly, will, when revising the scale of assessments this year, give full satisfaction to our legitimate claim and thus finally solve the case of Poland's assessment.

92. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Albania has asked to make a statement. I call upon him.

93. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): On behalf of the Government of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania, allow me to express heartfelt thanks to you, Mr. President, and to the representative of Italy for the deep condolences expressed on the passing away of the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, as well as to the other delegations that have already done so to us personally.

94. Enver Hoxha was the founder of the Communist Party of Albania—today the Labour Party of Albania—the organizer and leader of the war of national liberation and our people's revolution, the founder of the new Albanian State and the architect of the construction of socialist Albania. Indeed, the life of Enver Hoxha is the living history of present-day Albania.

95. In all the stages that the Albanian people have traversed, in all the key moments when the destinies of the people and the homeland were decided upon, his thinking and personality were always present. His leadership and direction were decisive.

96. If Albania is today an advanced socialist country which develops by relying on its own forces, a homeland of the people that are free from every social and spiritual oppression, a country of democracy and well-being for all and of education and culture for the broad masses of the people, this is attributed to the war waged by the Albanian people, with the Party and Comrade Hoxha at the head. It was he who worked out the general lines of the foreign policy and the stands of our State on international questions.

Suspension of the session

97. The PRESIDENT: I should like to thank all representatives, the Secretary-General and the Secretariat staff for their co-operation in the work of this resumed session.

98. In accordance with Assembly decision 39/456 of 18 December 1984, and bearing in mind the action taken by the Assembly at this meeting, the following items remain on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly: item 17 (*i*): Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; item 25: The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives; item 38: Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development; item 41: Observance of the quincentenary of the discovery of America; item 42: Question of Cyprus; item 43: Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations; item 44: Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq; and item 140: Celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in the British Empire.

99. I now declare the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly suspended.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

NOTE

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 109th meeting, paras. 26 and 27.

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records

108th PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 16 September 1985,
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA (Zambia).

Resumption of the session

1. The PRESIDENT: I declare the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly resumed, in accordance with decision 39/456 of 18 December 1984.

Tribute to the memory of a head of State and former Presidents of the General Assembly

2. The PRESIDENT: Before we consider the items on the agenda for this afternoon, it is my sad duty to recall to the General Assembly the deaths of Mr. Linden Forbes Burnham, President of the Republic of Guyana; Mr. Luis Padilla Nervo, President of the sixth session of the General Assembly, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mexico and former Judge of the International Court of Justice; and Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, President of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly and first Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan, which have occurred since the suspension of the thirty-ninth session of the Assembly on 12 April 1985.

3. I invite representatives to stand and observe a minute of silence in tribute to their memory.

The members of the Assembly observed a minute of silence.

4. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Guyana.

5. Mr. KARRAN (Guyana): I make this statement with mixed feelings. It is very kind of you, Mr. President, and the General Assembly to express your sympathy in the way you have. Comrade Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham guided the destiny of the Guyanese people for 21 years. During that period he saw Guyana move from colonialism to independence—independence which he cherished dearly. He brought our small nation out of obscurity, and through his foreign policy Guyana became known and respected internationally. I speak in particular of Guyana's commitment to and involvement in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, its involvement in issues of the third world and its involvement in the councils of the United Nations. Under his presidency, Guyana dedicated itself to the development of regional integration and was a driving force in the process which culminated in the establishment of the Caribbean Community [*CARICOM*].

6. By his death, the national liberation movements throughout the world have lost a committed friend and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has lost a true friend. He felt deeply for the oppressed peoples of the world.

7. The Commonwealth countries have lost a friend and so has CARICOM. It was with great shock and deep sadness that the Guyanese community learned of his sudden death. However, he has laid a foundation for development within our national boundaries. He believed in multilateral institutions and he was committed to the Organization—the United Nations—and its workings. It had his unswerving support.

8. On behalf of the Government and the people of Guyana and the bereaved family of the late President Burnham, I should like to extend my warmest and sincerest thanks for the sentiments expressed here this afternoon.

9. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Luis Padilla Nervo, a distinguished Mexican and an eminent internationalist, passed away on 9 September at the age of 87. A career diplomat and a government official for over half a century, he gave service to the international community.

10. He was President of the General Assembly at its sixth session and Judge of the International Court of Justice from 1964 to 1973. Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country from 1952 to 1958, Padilla Nervo was twice representative of Mexico to the United Nations and, together with Brazil, was one of the first Latin American members on the Security Council.

11. Throughout his long career, he distinguished himself as one of the most faithful interpreters of my country's foreign policy and of the deeply nationalist feelings of our people, firmly expressed in the Mexican revolution of 1910 and of which our own diplomatic action has been both the reflection and the spearhead.

12. Padilla Nervo carried out that policy in an exemplary way, a policy which has always been based on principles. Since the days of San Francisco when the United Nations was being formed, he accomplished his work and he can therefore quite rightly be considered one who fashioned our contemporary multilateral diplomacy and one of the steadfast champions of decolonization, disarmament and international co-operation. He always sought harmony among States, but he also stood firmly against the excesses of the mighty.

13. May his work be a lesson to everyone as well as encouragement to all. May the sovereignty of Mexico, vigorously reaffirmed in this forum, continue to strengthen equality among nations and the dignity of the Organization. That, Mr. President, is my hope as I thank you, on behalf of my country and on that of Mr. Padilla Nervo's family, for your generous words.

14. I also wish to thank the General Assembly for the tribute that it has paid to the memory of my outstanding fellow countryman on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and on the day when, by a significant coincidence, Mexico is celebrating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of its own independence.

15. Mr. Shah NAWAZ (Pakistan): It is a sad day for me to make this brief statement on the passing of one of the most brilliant statesmen of our time, Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, who died only a few days ago at the age of 92. He was a well-known internationalist and has been greatly respected and admired by the world community for a number of years. His life span covered practically a whole century of our time. During his long and fruitful career, he served the international community in many diverse ways.

16. First, he began his great career in Pakistan and, with the coming of Pakistan's independence, he had already played a very important role in the freedom movement. Soon afterwards he became the first Minister for Foreign Affairs of the free country of Pakistan.

17. During his time as Foreign Minister, he served the cause of Islam and of the Arab world in particular, as well as the cause of all liberation movements, during a fruitful and brilliant career. A number of nations that are free today and are Members of the United Nations must surely remember the sterling part that he played in their freedom movements.

18. Later on, he had a great career in the field of law, in which he excelled as a brilliant lawyer. Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan was recognized by the international community and he became a Judge of the International Court of Justice, where he had a long and fruitful career. His name is still remembered and highly respected.

19. Thereafter he retired to private life, but he continued his interest in international affairs and was the author of a number of books in which his great experience of world affairs was richly reflected.

20. I knew him personally over a long period and I had the greatest admiration and affection for him. It is really a sad occasion for me today to make this statement on the occasion of his demise.

21. Mr. President, I am most grateful to you and to the international community represented in this hall for the honour that has been done to us and to his memory. I am most grateful for the words of praise and the message of condolence that were read out, and I wish to thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 115

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*concluded*)

22. The PRESIDENT: I should now like to invite the attention of the General Assembly to document A/39/883/Add.2, which contains a letter addressed to me by the Secretary-General informing me that, since the issuance of his last communication [*A/39/883/Add.1*] dated 11 April 1985, Chad, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Paraguay, Romania and Zaire have made the necessary payments to reduce their arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter. May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of this information?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*concluded*):*

(*i*) Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

23. The PRESIDENT: The Secretary-General has informed me that he is continuing his consultations in regard to this matter and that he hopes to be in a position to present a name during the fortieth session of the General Assembly. In the interim period, the senior Deputy Secretary-General of UNCTAD will continue to act as its officer-in-charge.

24. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of this information and wishes to include sub-item 17 (*i*) in the draft agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided (decision 39/324 B).

25. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, I should like to make the following statement.

26. The socialist countries, which have participated very actively in the creation of UNCTAD, are aware of the great importance of that organization, whose contribution in the preparation of new ideas and concepts dealing with radical changes in international economic relations on a just and democratic basis is widely recognized. The role of UNCTAD at the present time is even greater, since it is a forum where it is possible to discuss and adopt decisions on a wide range of topical economic, financial and trade issues that are more urgent than ever for the international community, and above all for the developing countries.

27. At the present time, as we are approaching the seventh session of the Conference, we must once again draw attention to an abnormal situation. For almost a year now, that important organization has been working without a Secretary-General. In the joint statement of our delegations to the General Assembly on 18 December last [*105th meeting, para. 79*], we indicated our hope that the question of the appointment of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD would be resolved as soon as possible, to make it possible for that organization to accomplish its work under normal conditions.

28. We now ask once again that there be no delay in resolving this problem, because UNCTAD's continued success requires that it have at its head a leader with authority who enjoys the broad support of Member States.

---

*Resumed from the 106th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 25

The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)*

29. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to include this item in the draft agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 38

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development (*concluded*)

30. The PRESIDENT: In my statement on 12 April 1985, at the resumed session, I proposed, and the Assembly agreed, in regard to agenda item 38, to "keep the . . . item open in order to allow time for further informal, but intensive, consultations after the suspension of the session and to reconvene on short notice to consider any decisions or agreements that might emerge from the consultations" [*107th meeting, para. 9*]. Regrettably, no substantive progress has emerged since that time to allow the launching of global negotiations by the General Assembly.

31. As I, as well as my predecessors, have stated on various occasions, the concept of global negotiations, as initiated in Assembly resolution 34/138 and as it has evolved subsequently in the last few years, continues to be valid. It is in the interest of all States to concert their efforts in promoting international co-operation for economic development, one of the essential prerequisites for the maintenance of international peace and security.

32. In my last statement, I went to the extent of suggesting that "it would be an abrogation of Article 1, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter, especially during this year of the fortieth anniversary—a time for recommitment—if we were to abandon the search for the consensus required to launch the global negotiations" [*ibid., para. 8*]. This remains my conviction today, and I believe that efforts should continue to be made to achieve this common objective of ours.

33. On the course of action to be followed by the General Assembly at the closure of this session, I would propose, on the basis of informal consultations, that the Assembly include in the draft agenda of its fortieth session the item entitled "Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development". If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided (decision 39/454C).

34. The PRESIDENT: I wish once again to address a plea to all Member States seriously to take stock of the current situation and to renew their efforts and commitment to co-operate in a spirit of mutual understanding and flexibility, and in the interest of the international community as a whole, in our common pursuit of solutions to the economic problems which confront all of us today.

35. I now call on the representative of Egypt, who will speak on behalf of the Group of 77.

36. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): One more session of the General Assembly is drawing to a close with nothing to show on a very important issue, namely the launching of global negotiations on international co-operation for development.

37. For its part, the Group of 77 has, I hope it will be conceded, spared no effort to create conditions in which the international community could find ways and means to reactivate the stalled North-South dialogue. Unfortunately, these efforts to obtain a favourable response to global negotiations from our partners to the north continue to meet with a deafening silence.

38. Some quarters may wish to see the concept of global negotiations abandoned. Allow me to stress that these voices do not deter us, for we in the developing world believe that the concept of global negotiations basically reflects a sincere call for international co-operation. Interdependence is a reality, and hence we continue to uphold multilateralism and to reject a return to narrow nationalistic approaches with their negative consequences for the international economic system as a whole.

39. It was the inequity and inadequacy of the present international economic system in the first place that prompted the Group of 77 to initiate the idea of global negotiations, and it is the crises which clearly continue to plague the world economy that demonstrate the continuing validity of that idea in bringing about an orderly restructuring of international economic relations.

40. The Group of 77 has consistently reaffirmed its full commitment to global negotiations in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/138, and we have maintained a flexible approach in our endeavours to bring about an early launching of those negotiations. We continue to believe that if that spirit is to be genuinely reciprocated by our partners, any approach to the subject from a narrow perspective of short-term loss and benefit should be discarded, for it negates the fact of interdependence and ignores the realities of the present world economy.

41. That is why we believe that lasting solutions to the inherent structural imbalances besetting the world economy will be attained only through a process of constructive dialogue that recognizes the global character of the problems involved. That approach is certainly better than the sectorally compartmentalized approach that has characterized past efforts, which are still deadlocked. That fact in itself provides further proof of the continuing relevance of the global negotiations. That concept, as is well known, is predicated upon the need for an integrated and simultaneous approach that addresses the full range of issues in the major spheres of international economic relations in terms of their interrelationship. We believe that that basic concept bears repetition. It is our considered opinion that that concept, which draws its support from the principles of mutual benefit, solidarity and interdependence, offers a coherent response to the growing complexity of international economic relations.

42. At the close of the thirty-ninth session, we in the Group of 77 wish to express anew our deep concern that 11 years after the unanimous adoption by the General Assembly of resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) on the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International

---

*Resumed from the 105th meeting.

Economic Order, there has been no significant progress in their implementation.

43. We are all, North and South, in the same boat; we all run a risk and face a challenge that must be met with all the resolve and foresight that we can muster. Forty years after the inception of the United Nations, we are still facing the challenge of realizing the full potential of international co-operation.

44. We in the Group of 77 are and always will be in the forefront in defending the role and objectives of the United Nations system, which we believe is uniquely capable of devising formulas that can translate interdependence into concrete steps that can progressively achieve prosperity, stability and peace for all mankind. That is our message to our partners.

45. Allow me also, Mr. President, to express appreciation of your efforts and assure you that the Group of 77 will continue to maintain its constructive approach. We are legitimately seeking greater international economic co-operation and development. That for us will remain in the centre of the global agenda. We shall continue to urge the international community to move towards attaining an international economic order based upon the principles of justice, equality and mutual benefit.

46. We also consider that the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations could provide a valuable opportunity for reaffirmation by the international community of the goals and objectives of international economic co-operation and for strengthening the multilateral economic system. You were kind enough, Sir, to remind us a few moments ago again of one of the basic principles expressed in the opening words of the Charter. We hope and believe that the participation of an impressive number of heads of State or Government will prove a propitious occasion for individually and collectively providing the political impetus for a renewed dialogue between the developed and the developing countries.

47. The **PRESIDENT**: I now call on the representative of Luxembourg, who will speak on behalf of the States members of the European Community.

48. Mr. **PHILIPPE** (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): The European Community and its member countries, on whose behalf it is my honour to speak, have on many occasions in the past indicated the reasons why they continue to participate actively and, we believe constructively in the various bodies in which the North-South dialogue is taking place. We are more than ever convinced that the growing interdependence of economies makes it all the more important to narrow the differences between the views of the interested parties, in terms of both the objectives of the dialogue and the identification of ways and means. It is in that spirit that we will persist in our efforts to bring about a greater convergence of views on a basis that makes it possible to achieve negotiated agreements at the various levels of international co-operation.

49. The European Community and its member States consider the objective of launching global negotiations in the light of that overall concept of the North-South dialogue.

50. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, who will speak on behalf of the Eastern European States.

51. Mr. **OUDOVENKO** (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic wish to state that the socialist countries supported General Assembly resolution 34/138, on the question of global negotiations relating to international economic co-operation for development and continue to support the early implementation of that resolution. That position has been repeatedly confirmed at the highest Party, State and governmental levels of our countries in documents of the Warsaw Treaty and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

52. The Declaration on the Preservation of Peace and International Economic Co-operation adopted on 14 June 1984 at the high-level Economic Conference of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance held in Moscow states:

> "The participants in the Conference reaffirm the need to expand the role of the United Nations and its organizations as important forums for harnessing the efforts of States in order to strengthen peace and international security and help to solve urgent world problems. To achieve that end, the member countries of CMEA are prepared to continue to participate actively in their work. They favour the earliest possible start of global negotiations within the United Nations on the most important international economic problems in accordance with the decisions of the Organization, with the participation of all States and with regard for their legitimate interests." [*See A/39/323, annex II.*]

53. On the basis of this position of principle, the socialist States on whose behalf I am speaking wish to express their high appreciation of the efforts by you, Sir, in order to accelerate the beginning of global negotiations as provided for in General Assembly resolution 34/138. We agree with your proposal to refer the question of global negotiations for inclusion on the agenda of the fortieth session of the General Assembly. The delegations of the socialist countries wish to express the hope that discussion of this question at the fortieth anniversary session of the General Assembly will make it possible to break the cycle of procedural debate and to embark on the actual work of preparing for global negotiations, in the interests of equitable economic co-operation and the carrying out of United Nations decisions on the restructuring of international economic relations and the establishment of a new international economic order.

54. Mr. **WANG Baoliu** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, first of all I wish to express our appreciation to you for your efforts during the past year on this item. Since the adoption of resolution 34/138 by the General Assembly on the basis of consensus, six years have passed. In spite of the positive and constructive efforts made by the Group of 77 and a number of delegations, the launching of global negotiations has been delayed year after year. Consultations conducted since April this year have not yielded any concrete result. People cannot but feel regret.

55. In recent years, the structural flaws of the world economy and the harm they have done to the economies of the developing countries have increasingly demonstrated the need to conduct global negotiations so as to deal comprehensively with the global economic issues, to establish a new system of international economic relations and to revitalize the world economy, in particular the economies of the developing countries.

56. Therefore it is correct for you to remind all Member States of the continuing validity of the concept of the commitment by the General Assembly to global negotiations as embodied in resolution 34/138. Although our path may be arduous and difficult, we should not give up our efforts to seek ways and means to launch global negotiations. We support your proposal to include this item in the draft agenda of the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

57. China will continue to participate actively in the work on this item. It is our hope that all sides will make further efforts and strengthen international economic co-operation for development. In particular, the parties concerned should give serious consideration to the reality of increasing the interrelatedness of the economies of various countries and to the overall interest of the international community and adopt a flexible and constructive attitude so as to facilitate an early agreement on the launching of global negotiations.

58. Mr. IMMERMAN (United States of America): Mr. President, the United States delegation would like to thank you for your efforts in this area. The Government of the United States, together with a great many others represented here, has devoted a considerable amount of time and effort attempting to achieve agreement on the matter subsumed under agenda item 38. We will maintain our constructive and co-operative interest in this item and we will continue to play a full and active role in this process.

AGENDA ITEM 41

Observance of the quincentenary of the discovery of America (*concluded*)*

59. The PRESIDENT: In connection with this item, representatives will recall that on 21 September 1984 the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the thirty-ninth session [*3rd meeting*]. May I take it that it is now the Assembly's wish to defer its consideration and to include this item in the draft agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided (decision 39/463).

AGENDA ITEM 42

Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)*

60. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that on 21 September 1984 the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the present session [*3rd meeting*], but deferred a decision on the allocation of the item to an appropriate time in the future. It is my understanding that it would be desirable to defer consideration of this item to the fortieth session of the General Assembly. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to defer consideration of the item and to include it in the draft agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided (decision 39/464).

AGENDA ITEM 43

Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations (*concluded*)*

61. The PRESIDENT: In connection with this item, I have received a letter from the representative of Cyprus requesting that the item be included in the draft agenda of the fortieth session. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to include the item in the draft agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided (decision 39/465).

AGENDA ITEM 44

Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq (*concluded*)*

62. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly decided on 21 September 1984 [*3rd meeting*] to include this item in the agenda of the thirty-ninth session. It is my understanding that it would be desirable to defer consideration of this item to the fortieth session of the General Assembly. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to defer consideration of the item and to include it in the draft agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided (decision 39/466).

AGENDA ITEM 140

Celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in the British Empire (*concluded*)*

63. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly decided on 21 September 1984 [*3rd meeting*] to include this item in the agenda of the thirty-ninth session. May I take it that it is now the wish of the Assembly to defer consideration of the item and to include it in the draft agenda of the fortieth session?

It was so decided (decision 39/467).

Statement by the President

64. The PRESIDENT: Nine months ago, when we suspended the work of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly [*105th meeting*], I pointed out that at that stage each one of us in this Hall would assess the work of the session on the basis of our respective national policies and perceptions of the Organization, as well as from the perspective of successes and failures.

65. Today as we formally conclude our work and as we make our final assessment or stock-taking, I should like to suggest once again that the correct yardstick of any objective evaluation should be based on the Charter of the United Nations, and that we ask ourselves whether the thirty-ninth session has

---

*Resumed from the 105th meeting.

achieved any of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world, which, after all, we represent.

66. When we consider the number of items on our agenda—143 in all—when we consider the magnitude and complexity of the problems which confront us at all levels, and judging from the international climate in the past 21 months, I strongly believe that the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly did advance the cause of international peace—and here I mean all aspects of peace.

67. Some of the problems with which we had to deal with were deep-rooted. Many of them had even preceded the founding of the United Nations. Others were complicated and aggravated, not so much by the so-called acrimonious debates, if any, within these walls, but perhaps more so by human and natural forces external to the Organization—forces such as narrow nationalism, misguided policies, political intransigence, delaying tactics, short-sightedness, honest mistakes and, I should add, the vagaries of the weather—that is, floods, hurricanes and drought. Allow me to mention that much of what is painstakingly accomplished within the walls of this building is often undone or destroyed outside the Organization.

68. What others may describe as the failures of this session of the General Assembly should, in my view, be regarded as unfinished business. The pursuit of peace—peace at home and peace in the world—is an ongoing process. Despite the obstacles and despite the disappointments, we cannot abandon the pursuit of peace.

69. In view of the importance which previous sessions attached to it, and based on my own conviction that economic self-sufficiency is one of the most effective instruments for achieving the goals and objectives of the Charter, I was particularly interested in the agenda item entitled "Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development". Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to reach the stage where we can say with confidence that those negotiations will be launched on a specific date.

70. Granted that the Assembly did not solve the serious debt and foreign exchange problems which are crippling the economies of a large number of States represented here; granted that the threat of nuclear weapons still hangs ominously over mankind; granted that the inhuman policy of *apartheid*—a subject which has been on the agenda of the United Nations for over three decades—has not been eliminated; granted that the questions of Palestine, Namibia, Kampuchea and the Middle East, and the situations in Afghanistan and Central America, and others, were not completely resolved during this session; and granted that many of the resolutions and recommendations which were adopted by the thirty-ninth session of the Assembly appear to have fallen on partially deaf ears, we should at the same time realize that the Assembly did provide a meeting place for friend and foe alike. In the midst of what some may describe as rhetoric, there were genuine words of commitment and hope. We have already seen some positive results from our deliberations and from the political atmosphere which the thirty-ninth session created.

71. The seeds of co-operation and consensus which we planted on 3 December 1984 have already borne fruit. I refer to the adoption of a comprehensive Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa [*resolution 39/29, annex*]. Directly and indirectly, the Declaration and the spirit behind it have already saved the lives of millions of our fellow human beings. Here I should like to state that the efforts of the Secretary-General, through the United Nations Office for Emergency Operations in Africa, and all other United Nations agencies and those of individual Governments and non-governmental organizations—including those in the entertainment field—deserve our deep appreciation. Unfortunately, thousands of our brothers and sisters did not benefit from these efforts. Assistance came too late. Their world did not heed in time the signals of alarm—and, by the way, the alarm is still on.

72. I wish to mention further that, as a result of our deliberations, the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women did take place, to the surprise of sceptics who had predicted its doom. As a result of perseverance over the years, and the spirit of accommodation which prevailed in many areas during the session, we were able to complete a new symbol of comfort and protection for the victims of torture and other cruel and degrading treatment or punishment.

73. The Secretary-General's profound and timely statement at the present session, on 12 December 1984 [*97th meeting, paras. 292 to 307*] on the question of disarmament complemented the record number of resolutions which the Assembly adopted on that subject. At least the session placed all aspects of the arms race and the threat posed by nuclear weapons in their true perspective. The new dimensions of the nuclear age were analysed. The Assembly, through its candid debate, set an example in international behaviour—an example which underlines the view that channels of communication should be constantly kept open if we are to move forward in the area of disarmament. We are therefore encouraged by the prospects for high-level dialogue on arms control between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

74. I still maintain the position which I advanced last December that, in spite of its unresolved and unfinished business, the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly has fulfilled some of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world. As I mentioned earlier, we have already seen some of the results of the work of the session; it is my earnest hope that others will be forthcoming. It will obviously take some time for some of the seedlings which we have planted to grow and bear fruit. They will need attention, care and nurturing.

75. This is the end of an Assembly session; it is also the beginning of the next step ahead on the long and often hazardous road towards the ultimate goal of universal peace. If we do not get there, we should at least be able to say that we have tried and that along the way we made the world a better place—better than we had found it.

76. Finally, I take this opportunity to express once again my sincere thanks to delegations, to the Secretary-General, to the Bureau, to the Chairmen of the regional groups, to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs and to other members of the Secretariat for their co-operation and assistance, without which I would have found it extremely difficult to preside over the Assembly. I should also like to express my appreciation to the representatives of non-governmental

organizations and members of the media, who in their own way have contributed to the work of the session.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Minute of silent prayer or meditation

77. The PRESIDENT: We are now coming to the end of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. I invite representatives to stand and observe one minute of silent prayer or meditation.

The members of the Assembly observed a minute of silence.

Closure of the session

78. The PRESIDENT: I declare closed the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 05000 80-04658—April 1980—2,100